FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 021

31 January 1983

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

IZVESTIYA on Soviet Nuclear-Free Zone Proposal [Zubko, 30 Jan] AA 1
United States 'Rejects' Soviet Zone Proposal [Kalyagin] AA 1
Moscow TV on Arms Options, Soviet Proposals [Gerasimov] AA 2
Zagladin Discusses INF Position, French Missiles [Paris L'HUMANITE 26 Jan] AA 3
Semeyko Article Previews Geneva Talks [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jan] AA 4
Prospects for Arms Talks 'Depend on U.S. Stance' [Petrovskiy in NOVOYE VREMYA No 4] AA 6
PRAVDA Views Opportunities at Geneva Talks [30 Jan] AA 7
Bogachev Says U.S. Arms Stance 'Uncompromising' AA 8
U.S. 'Obstructionist Tactics' at Geneva Scored [Aleksandrov] AA 9
USSR Rejects U.S. Disarmament 'Demand' [Fesunenko] AA 10
Moscow Comments on Senate Call for Nuclear Freeze [Kozyakov] AA 11
PRAVDA Correspondent on Rostow Resignation [Tolkunov, 17 Jan] AA 12
Radio Comment [Alekseyev] AA 13

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Rountable [Vedenyapin, Volskiy, Nekrasov] CC 1
Reaction to Prague Meeting CC 1
Resumption of Arms Talks CC 3
Mood in West Europe CC 4
U.S.-Japanese Relations CC 5
Situation in Central America CC 6
Moscow TV's 29 January 'Studio 9' Program [Zorin, Shishlin, Chervov] CC 7
Pact Arms Control Proposals CC 7
U.S. Response, Strength Viewed CC 9
Geneva Talks CC 12
U.S. Military Preparations CC 15
U.S. Relations With Allies CC 16
USSR 'Measures of Confidence' CC 17
U.S. Criticisms CC 18
Zero Option Is 'Dead' CC 19

BUSH TRIP TO WEST EUROPE

Purpose of Bush Trip to Western Europe Assessed DD 1
Propaganda Campaign [IZVESTIYA 28 Jan] DD 1
U.S. Position at Geneva [Gubernatorov, Kachanov] DD 1
Antinuclear Movement [Shepilov] DD 2
'Nothing New' To Offer [Shalnev] DD 3
FINANCIAL TIMES Cited [Kalygin] DD 3
Arrival in Bonn Reported DD 4
Talks With Kohl, Genscher DD 4
'Difficult Mission' Ahead [Anikin, Federov] DD 5
WASHINGTON POST Cited DD 5

UNITED STATES & CANADA

'Dishonesty' of Reagans Proposed Budget Viewed [Gubernatorov] A 1
S 'tan on U.S. 'Campaign of Slander,' Budget A 1
Moscow Views 'Growing Danger' of B-52 Mishaps A 2
Report on USSR Economy 'Blow' to U.S. Leaders [Pozner] A 2
Moscow Notes Successful Test of Pershing Missiles [Levchenko, Gerasichev] A 3
Mood of Americans, Statements by Mondale Viewed [Kalyagin] A 4
Reagan Exposed by 'Slip' on Company Taxes [Vasilyev in PRAVDA] A 4

NORTHEAST ASIA

Shultz Far East Tour Aimed at 'Militarization' [Legantsov] C 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Strauss' Position on U.S. Missiles, Geneva Viewed [Mikhaylov in PRAVDA] G 1
Vogel's Washington, Moscow Trips Compared [Lomeyko in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 19 Jan] G 1
FRG Violation of Berlin Agreement Claimed G 3
Nuclear Deterrence Has Main Role in French Policy G 3
Shalayev-Led AUCCTU Delegation Arrives in Paris G 3
Communique on French-Soviet Symposium Released G 4
Opposition to Proposed NATO Bases in Italy Noted [Yuriyev] G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

CPSU Delegation Begins Visit in Lebanon 30 Jan H 1
Moscow Departure H 1
Arrival Statement in Beirut [Beirut Voice of Lebanon] H 1
Dialogue With Israel Rejected [SPA] H 1
Details of Soviet Army Delegation Visit to Syria [AFP] H 2
Syrian Ba'th Leader Receives Visiting CPSU Delegation [PRAVDA 21 Jan] H 2

Soviet Friendship Delegation Visits Jordan H 2
Meeting With Crown Prince [IZVESTIYA 22 Jan] H 2
Cooperation Plan Signed [PRAVDA 25 Jan] H 3
Mubarak U.S. Visit, Talks With Reagan Viewed H 3
Fesunenko Commentary H 4
Qatar Foreign Minister Favors USSR Mideast Role H 4
[Mnatsakanov]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Somali Offer of Talks With Ethiopia Denounced J 1
Aspects of U.S.-S. Africa Relations Examined J 2
U.S.-Sponsored 'Nuclear Ambitions' J 2
[PRAVDA 31 Jan]
Similar to U.S.-Israeli Ties J 2
[Gerasimov]
Telegrams Exchanged With Upper Volta Leader J 3
[IZVESTIYA 20 Jan]
Briefs: Shakirov Departs Mauritius J 3

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Pending U.S.-Honduras Military Exercises Discussed K 1
Rumored Policy Changes Belied K 1
[Fesunenko]
'New Undisguised Provocation' K 1
[Gorbunov]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Politburo Meeting on Gromyko Trip, Agriculture R 1
Ponomarev Addresses Seminar for Propagandists R 2
Aliyev, Others Address Transportation Questions R 2

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agricultural Developments for 27-29 January T 1
New RSFSR Minister of Agriculture Appointed T 1
RSFSR Land Reclamation Problems, Tasks Discussed T 2

IZVESTIYA ON SOVIET NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE PROPOSAL

PM311041 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jan 83 Morning Edition p 3

[M. Zubko "International Commentary": "A Useful Initiative"]

[Text] The Soviet Union and th other socialist countries are continuing their persistent and consistent struggle to ease nuclear missile confrontation in Europe and to avert the threat of nuclear conflict developing. This was further confirmed by the publication in the press of the Soviet side's positive response to the Swedish Government's initiative on creating in Europe a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons (tactical weapons in the possession of troop formations -- divisions, brigades).

This response is the logical expression of our country's principled attitude to the creation of nuclear-free zones. In the peace program proclaimed by the 24th CPSU Congress our party set the following task: "promoting the creation of nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world." It is well known that the USSR is a long-standing supporter of Finland's proposal that the north of Europe be declared a nuclear-free zone. Moreover, our country has expressed its readiness to pledge not to use nuclear weapons against the north European states in the zone.

The Soviet Union also viewed positively the idea of creating a similar zone in the Balkans. Our country has also supported other proposals: on declaring Africa and the Near East nuclear-free zones, as well as Latin America, and creating peace zones in Southeast Asia, in the Indian Ocean and in the Mediterranean.

In its response the Soviet side did more than merely express a positive attitude to Sweden's proposal. According to the Swedish option, an approximately 300 km wide zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons would be created in Europe (extending 150 km on either side of the line of contact between the Warsaw Pact and NATO states). The Soviet Union expressed its readiness to extend this zone to 500-600 km. And this fact is eloquent evidence of the Soviet Union's sincere approach to the cause of preserving peace in Europe.

The Soviet side told the Swedish Government that the USSR is prepared to participate in talks on creating such a zone -- talks which would consider questions relating to the geographical dimensions of the zone and other questions, including monitoring the fulfillment of the sides' pledges with respect to such a zone.

What is NATO's attitude to Sweden's proposal? As far as we know, there has been no official response yet. One can only cite the major Swedish morning paper DAGENS NYHETER, which wrote the other day that "the NATO capitals have adopted a wait-and-see or almost negative position." But there are forces in West Europe which welcome the Swedish initiative. A spokesman for the Social Democratic Party of Germany, FRG Bundestag Deputy K. Voigt, for example, declared that in the event of an outbreak of conflict the availability of battlefield nuclear weapons would lead to their being used at the earliest stage of the conflict.

The creation of a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons would undoubtedly help to ease the tense situation of nuclear confrontation which has developed in Europe, particularly in the central part of Europe.

UNITED STATES 'REJECTS' SOVIET ZONE PROPOSAL

LD301058 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1245 GMT 29 Jan 83

[From the "International Review" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] A representative of the U.S. State Department stated that the Soviet proposals concerning the creation of a corridor in central Europe free from tactical nuclear weapons are unrealistic.

The United States rejects them as they allegedly do not help to create stability and security in Europe. In Washington's logic the cause of security in Europe should aid the provocative plans of the Pentagon to move American military bases in West Germany nearer to the borders of socialist countries or to deploy new American nuclear missiles there. This is the logic of those who have made a stake on confrontation and accelerating tension. By the way, in his polemical excitement the representative of the State Department called the proposal on the creation of a nuclear-free corridor a Soviet one, although in this case it was put forward by Sweden. Moreover, the Reagan administration has so far not approved a single peaceful initiative, no matter who has put it forward.

MOSCOW TV ON ARMS OPTIONS, SOVIET PROPOSALS

LD301916 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russain 1615 GMT 30 Jan 83

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] Last Thursday in Geneva talks on nuclear weapons in Europe resumed. This Sunday Vice President George Bush is off to Europe to discuss this question. What does Bush have in his luggage? If he is going to listen, then he will hear over the 12 days in the 7 countries a great deal about the unreality and even the absurdity of the zero option, and he will hear it from close friends too. But he is hardly going to listen. First and foremost he is going to talk; to talk about the advantages of firmness and to bring matters to a point where the talks break down. It is possible to understand this position although it is impossible to accept it.

In reality, let us dwell for a moment on the position of the Pentagon strategists who are planning how to get the upperhand in a war with the Soviet Union. For them, medium-range missiles in Europe are even better than long-range missiles somewhere in America. They are located closer to their targets and their flight time is only a few minutes. They are a tempting first strike weapon so why should they be rejected? It is like a duel where one of the combatants has a longer sword than the other -- why should he shorten it? The Pentagon has no reason to negotiate the point [dogovarivatsya].

Now let us dwell for a moment on the position of the Europeans. They hear discussion from the other side of the ocean concerning Europe as a theater for military operations and are apprehensive over whether in reality the U.S. directors might put on in this theater one of those classical tragedies in which all the characters die in the final scene. They hear discussions from the other side of the ocean on limiting a nuclear war and are apprehensive that America might square off its accounts at their expense -- that is, its accounts with the Soveit Union.

From this standpoint missiles are an extra temptation, all the more so because the Americans alone will be in command over them. In general, from the Europeans' viewpoint, things will be more dangerous with the U.S. missiles than without them.

Our proposal is that the Soviet Union have in Europe the same number of missiles as Britain and France. Britain and France say that their nuclear arsenals are autonomous and that they cannot be discussed in Geneva. The Soviet Union is not even proposing that they be discussed but is proposing that they be taken into consideration in drawing up the nuclear equation for Europe. There is every reason for this because the abovementioned autonomy is extremely conditional [uslovna]; Britain and France are members of NATO, therefore will they not fulfill their duty as allies? We must suppose that they will act together as is expected of members of a military alliance.

The election program of the FRG Social Democratic Party has this to say on this issue: When it is a question of parity between East and West all nuclear weapons, including British and French ones, must be taken into consideration. Helmut Schmidt, former German chancellor, warns that if the United States does not take up sincere positions, (?so there is an implication that it is not sincere at the moment), if the United States does not take a sincere position at the talks then the FRG may come out against the deployment of missiles.

That is how things are as far as missiles are concerned. Now let us look at the proposals of other countries. Sweden has proposed the creation of a nuclear-free zone 300 km wide dividing the blocs. Our response, taking into consideration the potentials of modern nuclear weapons in the battlefield, is that it would be better is the zone were 500 or 600 km wide, but we welcome the general principle [poisk]. What then was the response of the United States? Its response was that the idea is unrealistic and in fact any kind of nuclear-free corridor there, running across their theater for military operations, violates the scenario that has been set up.

Washington has a completely different view of the nature of East-West relations and military rivalry. We oppose military rivalry and that is why our peaceful drive has met with such a broad and lively response.

ZAGLADIN DISCUSSES INF POSITION, FRENCH MISSILES

PM281257 Paris L'HUMANITE in French 26 Jan 83 p 7

[Unattributed report: "Freeing Europe of All Nuclear Weapons: Vadim Zagladin Statement on Antenne 2"]

[Text] "The USSR wants to reduce and eliminate all missiles, but it does not want to be disarmed if the West remains armed." This was stated by yesterday's guest on Antenne 2's newsreel, Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department.

"Our starting position," he said, "is that it is necessary at all costs to avoid a nuclear war, whether major or minor. To this end it is necessary to reduce missiles or eliminate them. We are in favor of Europe's being without nuclear weapons -- any missiles at all. Totally free of nuclear weapons."

Asked about President Mitterrand's statements in Bonn last week, Vadim Zagladin said that he did not want to pass judgement on French policy, "because it is French policy," but stressed "Francois Mitterrand's idea that the negotiations must lead to a result, namely, a mutual agreement."

The Soviet leader said that the number of medium-range missiles was "virtually the same on both sides of Europe" and that the number of nuclear warheads is "about 2,000 in the Soviet Union and 3,400 in the Western countries as a whole."

"I do not see France, Vadim Zagladin said, "waging war on the Soviet Union, and moreover France must know that the Soviet Union will never wage war on it. Basically, we will not wage any wars. But we cannot fail to take into account the existence of nuclear weapons. There is no desire to discuss the French weapon with anyone but the French. France does what it likes with it!" [La France en fait ce qu'eue veut!]

Having pointed out the unilateral nature of the so-called "zero" option, Vadim Zagladin said: "We are optimistic; we believe that a solution can be found." He cited the proposal of a treaty of non-return ["non-retour," possible misprint for "non-recours," nonrecourse] to force made to the Atlantic treaty by the Prague summit. Asked about a possible visit by President Mitterrand to the USSR, Vadim Zagladin stressed that the head of state would be warmly welcomed if he did make such a visit.

Asked about Anatoliy Shcharanskiy's situation, Vadim Zagladin said: "His hunger strike is over; his state of health is good.

"Anatoliy Shcharanskiy is not a dissident," Vadim Zagladin said. "He is someone who has committed a crime -- a crime recognized by French law too. He has committed espionage, collected information about several dozen Soviet military enterprises and conveyed it to other people. This is a crime that must be punished."

SEMEYKO ARTICLE PREVIEWS GENEVA TALKS

PM281241 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jan 83 p 1

[Lev Semeyko "International Review": "Dialogue in Geneva"]

[Text] Our ideal is world peace. Durable, reliable and stable. It is the first and most urgent need of all people and all peoples. Lest the vast stocks of nuclear weapons undermine mankind's home, it is necessary to radically reduce and then liquidate them. While they exist, everything must be done to avoid establishing a precedent for using them.

The solution of this central task is the target of the USSR's solemn pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The solution of this task is also the aim of the Warsaw Pact countries' proposal on concluding a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and maintenance of relations of peace between the states of the two military political groupings -- the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The core of the treaty would be a mutual pledge by the members of both alliances not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms against one another. The proposal to disband both alliances and, as a first step, to liquidate their external [vneshnikh] organizations remains in force.

A new round of the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe starts in Geneva today. The new round of talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms (START) is planned to start at the beginning of February. During the break in the dialogue the sides have weighed up their positions and must now compare them to find a way out of the deadlock which occurred at the talks through Washington's fault.

The USSR's approach to lowering the level of nuclear confrontation both in Europe and between the USSR and the United States is based on one principle -- equality and equal security. The Soviet Union is prepared for a radical limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments which does not lead to securing one-sided military advantages. This is crucial.

Take "Eurostrategic" arms. The new Soviet initiative, put forward late last December by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, provides a way out of the deadlock. It is based on a real consideration of the situation, connected with the fact that the United States rejects a genuine "zero" solution -- total liquidation of medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. The USSR has proposed a different option whereby the USSR and the NATO countries reduce their medium-range armaments by more than two-thirds. But the United States is not prepared to do that either. Now the Soviet Union is declaring its readiness to keep in Europe only as many missiles as Britain and France have. To implement this option the USSR would dismantle hundreds of missiles, including several dozen of the most up-to-date missiles which the West calls SS-20's. This would be a really honest "zero" option as far as the USSR and the United States are concerned. At the same time, equality in terms of medium-range missiles between the USSR and NATO would be ensured. This level could then be lowered if London and Paris agreed. In addition, an accord must also be reached on bringing down to equal levels on both sides the number of Soviet and NATO countries' medium-range carrier aircraft in Europe.

The separate approach to the reduction of missiles and aircraft creates new opportunities for implementing the principle of equality and equal security. The USSR has taken a big step toward achieving an accord -- and this is widely acknowledged in the West by many statesmen and public figures.

However, judging by recent utterances by the Reagan administration, Washington continues to cling to the notorious "zero" option, whose implementation would ensure U.S. and NATO supremacy in the nuclear sphere. And it is no accident that it is clinging to it. To all appearances, the U.S. side intends to make the talks drag on for as long as possible, to blame the Soviet Union for this and to deploy the Pentagon's new nuclear missile arsenal in Europe at all costs. Washington's approach has been blocking the talks for more than a year now. It will not serve as the basis for achieving an accord, since it would seriously infringe the security interests of the USSR and its allies. It would be utterly unrealistic to believe that our country would agree to dismantle all its medium-range missiles without the United States and its nuclear allies' giving up a single aircraft, a single missile. Ye this is the essence of the American-style "zero" option.

A START accord would be of truly invaluable significance in terms of preventing a nuclear catastrophe and curtailing the strategic arms race. The last two rounds of talks on this problem have not provided a positive result. Again through the fault of the United States, whose aim is to obtain one-sided advantages through talks as well as the strategic arms race. This is evidenced by the U.S. position which Washington's representatives have so far held in Geneva.

In fact, if you take the whole complex of U.S. proposals, our country would have to dismantle more than 90 percent of all its ICBM's. This would undermine the foundation of our strategic defense might. At the same time, the United States would even be able to increase its capability of delivering a disarming first strike, which would undermine strategic stability and increase the threat of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict. Washington's position lacks a foundation which can serve as the basis for a quest for accord.

The USSR's proposals provide such a basis. It is a matter of the stage-by-stage reduction, by 1990, of the total quantity of ICBM, launch installations, submarine-based ballistic missiles and also heavy bombers to 1,800 units on each side. This would mean our country being ready to reduce its strategic armaments by more than 25 percent. U.S. armaments must be reduced accordingly, which would ensure an equal and considerable smaller number of strategic weapon carriers in the possession of both sides. All possible channels for pursuing the arms race in the strategic sphere would be cut off. As Yu. V. Andropov said recently, this would be only a beginning: An accord on the aforementioned basis would be the starting point for an even better mutual reduction of strategic arms taking into account the overall strategic situation in the world. While the talks are in progress it is necessary to freeze the sides' strategic arsenals, a position ensuring not only equality and equal security but also the most favorable conditions for conducting talks.

However, the United States is doing its best to distort the basic meaning of the Soviet proposals in Geneva and to show that the United States must make no effort to "push" the USSR into holding constructive talks. In what way? There is only one answer: by plans to deploy new strategic weapons systems, above all MX missiles. But, first of all, the USSR is a resolute advocate of successful talks on a just basis and needs no "pushing." Second, programs for the further buildup of strategic arms will not force our country into unilateral concessions. The USSR will be compelled to respond to the U.S. side's challenge by deploying its own corresponding weapon systems. By saying this the USSR is by no means threatening; it is urging the U.S. leaders to see the real situation and to recognize that disarmament must not be combined with new rounds of the arms race.

The Soviet Union never has had and does not have aggressive intentions. This is evidenced by its proposed extensive program of concrete measures leading to the cessation of the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, the easing of international tension and the safeguarding of all peoples' security.

It is particularly important to make such decisions at a time when the danger of war has increased so much and the world stands on the brink of the new "Eurostrategic" twist to the arms race planned by the United States and NATO and the creation of even more destructive strategic weapon systems. Time is of the essence. The year 1983 could be a turning point in the development of the world situation if realism prevails in Washington and the other NATO capitals. And the new year must be one. This is the demand of Soviet people and all people of good will. The very near future will tell whether this demand is to be satisfied. The position Washington adopts at the resumed talks in Geneva will demonstrate to what extent its assurances of adherence to the cause of peace accord with the facts. As for our country, as Yu.V. Andropov said, "the Soviet Union will do all it can to ensure a tranquil and peaceful future for the present and future generations. That is the aim of our policy, and we will not deviate from it."

PROSPECTS FOR ARMS TALKS 'DEPEND ON U.S. STANCE'

PM281429 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 4, 21 Jan 83 pp 18-20

[Doctor of Historical Sciences V. Petrovskiy article: "The Dialectics of the Nuclear Space Age"]

[Excerpt] When beginning new rounds of the arms race, the United States has resorted each time to blustering through its military programs by variations on the "Soviet threat" theme. Just look at what the Pentagon has dreamed up: In the fifties it was the bomber "gap," in the sixties, the missile "gap" and in the seventies the "gap" in defense spending, in weapons capable of hitting well-defended targets and in civil defense. At the beginning of the eighties a new phrase was brought into active political circulation in the United States -- the "window of vulnerability."

The U.S. delegation at the talks on specific questions of arms limitation and reduction is using unsubtle schemes of this kind. Thus in connection with the strategic arms limitation and reduction talks the United States is talking ad infinitum about the "highly destabilizing factor" which is at the Soviet Union's disposal. That "factor" is ground-based ICBM's. Washington is proposing the reduction of precisely the type of strategic weapon in which the USSR has numerical superiority. At the same time it is deliberately playing down the question of other strategic weapons in which the preponderance, and a large one at that, belongs to the United States: for example, in long-range cruise missiles, strategic aircraft or, finally, submarine-based ICBM warheads. And the U.S. forward-based facilities and the nuclear potentials of the U.S. NATO allies are already being forgotten.

The United States is also acting that way at the talks on nuclear arms in Europe. In pursuit of the same aim -- presenting the correlation between the sides' forces in a distorted light -- it singles out only missiles, and then only the Soviet Union's missiles, from the overall package of medium-range nuclear weapons, while "forgetting" the nuclear missiles possessed by Britain and France and also such components of the nuclear arsenals as medium-range carrier aircraft. If the U.S. side does talk about disarmament it does so on a completely unrealistic level -- the unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union.

In the present international situation, which has been seriously complicated through the fault of the imperialist forces, the urgent demand of the time is to remove the nuclear threat and curb the arms race. Such an opinion was expressed by the overwhelming majority of states at the recently ended 37th session of the UN General Assembly.

In the Soviet Union's policy the concern for peace is all-determining. Therein lies the essence of the peace program for the eighties approved by the 26th CPSU Congress and the foreign policy initiatives put forward in its development. Viewing the prevention of nuclear cataclysm as a paramount task, the Soviet Union -- and this is a characteristic feature of its political approach -- is proposing specific ways of reducing the danger of war and of containing the arms race. Unilaterally it assumed the commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons. That step of exceptional importance is aimed at promoting a move away from the current dangers to a reliable and stable peace and at strengthening people's hopes that nuclear conflagration will never erupt anywhere. The Soviet Union's initiative is also aimed at raising the level of confidence among states and facilitating the resolution of arms limitation questions, particularly of nuclear arms limitation.

Seeking a pretext to sabotage this initiative, the United States and its NATO allies are expatiating to the effect that the gamble on nuclear deterrence and the refusal to abandon the first nuclear strike concept are justified by the threat of attack from the USSR using conventional weapons. But as far back as 1976 the United Nations approved a Soviet proposal to conclude a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. The governments of the whole world were sent the Soviet draft for such a treaty prohibiting aggression by means of any weapons, either nuclear or conventional. However, it is the NATO countries headed by the United States that are resisting the conclusion of such a treaty.

There Is a Way Out

Among the practical measures for combating the nuclear arms race, the productive conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear arms limitation in Europe and on strategic arms limitation and reduction would be of paramount significance.

The state of affairs, however, is causing increasing doubts about the sincerity of the U.S. intentions. The belief is arising instinctively that the U.S. side, hiding behind the so-called "zero option" at the talks, is in fact striving for the full-scale deployment of new missiles in Europe.

As for strategic nuclear arms talks, so far we have seen, unfortunately, that while paying lip-service to "radical reductions" the U.S. side in fact has in mind basically a reduction of the Soviet strategic potential. But the United States would like to leave its own hands free to build up its strategic weapons. It goes without saying that it would be absurd to suppose that the Soviet Union would agree to that.

The prospects for the Geneva talks depend on the U.S. stance. The United States must now respond. The Soviet Union approaches the talks with a complete sense of responsibility and seeks honest agreements which would harm neither side and, at the same time, would lead to a reduction in their nuclear arsenals. This is demonstrated by the constructive proposals that it has made in Geneva. "We advocate equality," Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has stressed, "a consideration of the two sides' interests, and honest agreement. We are prepared for this."

PRAVDA VIEWS OPPORTUNITIES AT GENEVA TALKS

LD301020 Moscow TASS in English 0705 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS -- "Nowadays there is a tangible practical opportunity to prevent the threat hanging over the European Continent and the whole world. Such a chance is opened by the Soviet Union's fresh constructive proposals aimed at nuclear weapons reductions in Europe", PRAVDA points out today.

Touching upon the Soviet-American talks resumed in Geneva on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, PRAVDA writes:

"The Soviet proposals are strictly based on the principles of equality and equal security. Their implementation would relieve Europe of a heavy burden. The Soviet Union calls for reaching such a clear-cut and fair agreement, not to miss a truly historic opportunity while it exists. And this determines in a large measure the sentiments and hopes of the peoples in connection with the new round of the Soviet-American talks.

"The vital interests of peace in Europe," PRAVDA continues, "are incompatible with a build-up of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, it is necessary to reduce these arsenals. And the further talks in Geneva will show whether the opportunities existing for it are used. Now it is for the United States to have its say."

It is the dictates of common sense for all sides concerned, not only for the direct participants in the talks, to contribute to the resolution of that urgent task. "It is obvious, for example, that the leaders of the FRG Government can make their contribution to the effort that the West European NATO countries be not turned into a zone of a further sharp increase in the stockpiles of American nuclear weapons. The massive anti-war movement is becoming increasingly active."

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, PRAVDA writes in conclusion, its stand is clear: "It is for a fair agreement, for every possible decrease in the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe. And this is seen not only from its proposals at Geneva, but also from the support expressed by the Soviet Union the other day for the Swedish initiative to create in Europe a zone free from battlefield nuclear weapons."

BOGACHEV SAYS U.S. ARMS STANCE 'UNCOMPROMISING'

LD282026 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 28 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

While issuing protestations of the "moral justification and integrity" of the U.S. position at the talks on nuclear arms limitations in Europe, Washington officials continue to tout Reagan's pseudo-zero option as the "most stable, reliable and effective way to strengthen peace."

However, Washington's uncompromising stand on the question of nuclear arms has forfeited the support of not only Western Europe but also even of the conservative circles of the United States. A NEW YORK TIMES news analyst writes that both on the right and on the left there has emerged almost a concensus that the Reagan administration must desist from its so-called "zero option" at the Geneva talks.

A sharp opposition to the Reagan administration's posture at the talks in Geneva surfaced in U.S. Congress during the hearings to confirm Kenneth Adelman's nomination to the directorship of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Senator Claiborne Pell said, among other things, that the present U.S. Administration is bent on an arms race, rather than bringing arms under control. Senator Alan Cranston expressed his protest over Reagan's decision to entrust supervising the activities of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to a man who takes a contemptuous attitude even to the very process of limiting arms.

Faced with the mounting opposition to the U.S. plans to deploy new missiles in Europe, the Reagan administration has been forced to maneuvre, even issuing rumours about a "possible softening" of the U.S. position at the Geneva talks.

U.S. Vice President George Bush is setting out on a tour of West European countries with the mission to persuade the Europeans that Reagan possesses the flexibility needed for the success of the talks with the USSR. However, in discussions with FRG leaders in Bonn, the head of the U.S. delegation at the talks with the USSR Paul Nitze said that his instructions prescribe him to continue to firmly stick to the "zero option".

The Reagan administration has clearly set itself an impossible task -- that of convincing world public opinion of Washington's desire for headway at the talks, while still insisting on a unilateral disarmament on the part of the USSR in line with the modalities of the "zero option".

As is known, the U.S. so-called "zero option" provides for scrapping all Soviet medium-range missiles in the entire Soviet territory while leaving intact the present NATO nuclear forces in Western Europe.

Western propaganda ventures forecasts that the USSR will, eventually, be forced to agree to the "zero option", since the Soviet Union is, allegedly, more interested, than the U.S., in resolving the problem of the medium-range nuclear arms.

It ought to be stressed in this connection that the Soviet Union will in no case accept the so-called "zero option" since this would sharply upset, in favour of the U.S. and NATO, that parity in armaments which has evolved over many years.

What the world needs is not dramatic exhortations,attitudinising or posturing in public statements on questions of war and peace. The world public demands that the United States finally adopt a realistic and constructive stand at the Geneva talks, and make its first step towards stabilising the military and political situation on the Continent of Europe.

U.S. 'OBSTRUCTIONIST TACTICS' AT GENEVA SCORED

LD290030 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] The Soviet Union has approached the talks in Geneva on nuclear arms in Europe having advanced constructive compromise proposals, while the United States has resumed its seat at the negotiations table still insisting on its zero option plan, which is absolutely unacceptable to the Soviet Union because it amounts to demanding that this country should disarm unilaterally. Here is a commentary from Igor Aleksandrov:

The impression is that Washington is interested in maintaining a deadlock at the Geneva talks rather than making progress at them. The signs are that the White House is still bent on the idea of rearming Western Europe with intermediate nuclear missiles, that is, upsetting the existing parity of forces in the region. The indications are that Washington regards the Geneva talks as a cover for its nuclear buildup. While the talks in Geneva go on, the United States continues to test its missiles and preparations continue in Western Europe for the deployment of these missiles. At the same time work is in progress in the United States on the new MX and trident missiles and the B-52 bomber [as heard]. All these moves are aimed at gaining military superiority over the Soviet Union.

Washington's stand may lead to another dangerous round of the arms race. Its obstructionist tactics at the Geneva talks are being increasingly criticised in Western Europe and the United States itself. THE SUNDAY TIMES has said that Washington's response to Soviet proposals is so confused and so politically unwise that NATO's unity is clearly up for a grave test. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL says that the Reagan administration is trying to create the impression that Washington is treating seriously the Soviet arms control proposals.

Faced with this criticism, the Reagan administration is trying to launch a propaganda campaign and has issued a series of statements claiming that it has resolved to come to an agreement with the Soviet Union. Administration officials spread absolutely unjustified rumors that some kind of agreement was reached at the Soviet-American talks on medium-range weapons in Europe.

All these many words and lies are aimed at misleading public opinion in America and Europe and is stemming the tide of the movement against the proposed deployment of upgraded American missiles in Western Europe and in favor of freezing American nuclear arms. Meanwhile, the administration continues to claim that it is not responsible for the lack of progress at the Geneva talks. In a bid to push the campaign still further, the American President ordered several days ago that a special committee be formed at Cabinet level to plan the propaganda of the administration's foreign policy. The tour of Western Europe by Vice President George Bush clearly is a propaganda move. However, all these maneuvers cannot cover up the fact that the policies of the White House are not oriented toward reaching agreement but toward carrying on with an unbridled arms race and reaching supremacy, which is bound to increase the danger to world peace.

The new Soviet peace initiatives supported by other socialist countries pave the way for putting an end to the dangerous developments and the arms race and strengthening world peace and security. Broad sections of the world public and the governments of many countries are still waiting for Washington's reply to the constructive and honest Soviet proposals.

USSR REJECTS U.S. DISARMAMENT 'DEMAND'

LD282020 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 28 Jan 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] The Soviet-American negotiations on reducing nuclear weapons in Europe resumed in Geneva yesterday. I remind you that by mutual accord between the two sides, detailed reports on the progress of the sessions are not published, and this time you can read in your papers only a spare news item a few lines long this morning. This is a fully justified measure: A newspaper hue-and-cry surrounding such important talks could impede the normal work of the diplomats, although this at the same time is anything but the greatest obstacle to the normal progress of the negotiations. A much more serious obstacle to the way to achieving progress is the intransigence of the American side, which strives to impose on the Soviet Union the notorious zero option, that is, in exchange of abandoning deployment in Europe of 572 Pershing II nuclear missiles and cruise missiles the Americans demand the liquidation of all Soviet medium-range missiles, while over 700 forward-based missiles in Europe remain untouched, and in the overall balance no account is taken of approximately 260 units of nuclear weapons held by Britain and France.

In a word, an unacceptable demand is being put to us, meaning the unilateral disarmament of our country in the face of the ever-increasing nuclear threat literally on our very doorstep. Our position is well known. It was reaffirmed and reinforced with arguments in the December speech by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, and later in the Prague declaration of the Warsaw Pact member-states in which new constructive proposals were set forth by the socialist countries, in particular the proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and maintaining peaceful relations.

The force and conviction of these ideas was so great that Washington simply did not dare merely to dismiss them, as has sometimes happened previously. It was said in Washington that it is necessary to consider, weigh and discuss these proposals with the European allies.

Precisely with this aim, that of discussions with the allies, Vice President Bush is heading for Europe next week. Incidentally he is not taking any new American proposals with him, THE NEW YORK TIMES announced today. In the opinion of that paper's observer, Reagan continues to hold to his previous positions in questions of nuclear disarmament.

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON SENATE CALL FOR NUCLEAR FREEZE

LD291415 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 29 Jan 83

[Text] Thirty-four senators or one-third of all those in the Senate are coauthors of a draft resolution that was submitted last Wednesday by Senators Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts and Mark Hatfield of Oregon, a draft resolution on freezing the nuclear arms of the United States and the Soviet Union. Commentary has been prepared by Vladislav Kozyakov and here is what he writes:

We must do justice to the 34 senators and to the many colleagues of theirs in the House who have come out with a similar nuke-freeze resolution. With the American nuke-freeze supporters being referred to in the White House as almost foreign agents, it takes a measure of political courage to demand effective measures in nuclear disarmament. As the draft resolution shows, the 34 senators believe it's essential to warn that if the nuclear arms race continues it will bring the people of America and all other nations more dangers. It's also significant that many coauthors of the draft resolution call a spade a spade. They point out that the Reagan administration's policy toward nuclear arms control cannot but cause concern. Senator Edward Kennedy said that over the 2 years of office the Reagan administration has never before been in a greater mess with regard to nuclear arms control policy. And Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island said many disbelieve that the present government takes arms control seriously. He pointed out that the government is fuelling the fear widespread in the country that the Americans seem to gradually draw closer to a nuclear war.

A view of this kind is held not only by American senators. The public, government and members of parliament around the world have been voicing alarm at the United States policy of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and preparing for nuclear war. An equally alarming sign is this: At the talks with the Soviet Union on nuclear arms reduction the United States keeps advancing obstructionist and therefore unacceptable proposals. But time does not wait. To steer clear of a further buildup of mass-destruction weapons urgent and concrete steps must be taken -- urgent and concrete, because everything living on earth can be destroyed several times with the stockpiled weapons of mass-destruction.

A step in the right direction will be an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States to immediately freeze nuclear arms and move at once to drastic reductions of these arms. The Soviet Union is ready to do this if the United States does the same. General Secretary Yuriy Andropov reaffirmed the Soviet Union's position in his report on 21 December last year in connection with the 60th anniversary of the USSR. General Secretary Andropov said that for the duration of the talks the Soviet Union was suggesting what commonsense prompted, namely, freezing the strategic arms of both nations. At the same time the Soviet parliament and the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party urged the parliaments, governments, political parties and nations to combine efforts in order to preserve and strengthen world peace and ensure the basic human right, the right to life. The same appeal underlined readiness for freezing nuclear arms if the United States reciprocated. Understandably, the Soviet appeal was addressed to the United States, its Congress, administration and public. The nuke-freeze idea has many supporters in the United States if we recall the referendums held last November in nine of its states. Now the demand is reflected in the draft resolution submitted to the Senate and the House of representatives. We would like to hope that the official Soviet statements (?to) the United States on freezing nuclear arms will draw a positive response from the Congress and the administration. Then we could speak by right of a concrete step toward forestalling nuclear war and promoting world peace.

PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT ON ROSTOW RESIGNATION

PM251639 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 83 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch from correspondent A. Tolkunov under the rubric "Echo of the Week": "Washington Reshuffles"]

[Text] New York City, 16 Jan -- As has already been reported, Washington has announced another resignation. This time it was E. Rostow, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who bowed out. He did not just leave but was, in effect, fired by the President. There are to be other changes in the agency. The deputy directorship is to go to ex-congressman D. Emery, who is on the right wing of the Republican Party.

Unlike many other figures in the present administration E. Rostow was no novice when it came to the formulation of the country's foreign policy. As under secretary of state in the Johnson administration he was a staunch advocate of continuing and extending the dirty war in Vietnam, the intervention in the Dominican Republic and other aggressive militarist acts by official Washington. It was he who, in the mid-seventies, was one of the founders of the notorious "Committee on the Present Danger" -- the main propaganda vehicle of the hawks and the military-industrial complex. More than 50 of the committee's most active members are known to have taken up senior posts in the administration immediately after the Republicans took office. E. Rostow was not forgotten.

The local press has on a number of occasions reported on the incompetence of and lack of coordination between the officials who had been charged with the task of formulating a proposal on the further conduct of disarmament talks. Just like the swan, crayfish and pike in Krylov's fable, the State Department, the Pentagon and E. Rostow's agency were all pulling in different directions, putting forward their "options" for conducting talks "from a position of strength."

The fruit of months of "exploration" were the pseudoradical proposals on strategic systems and the so-called "zero option" on medium-range nuclear missiles, which former U.S. Secretary of State E. Muskie called a secret plan for undermining the nuclear arms control process in order to "allow the United States to 'rearm' in a futile quest for superiority."

But not even E. Rostow, a Democrat, fitted in at the White House. The patience of the reactionaries and archmilitarists on the Republican right wing, where the tone is set by superhawk Senator J. Helms, ran out with recent statements by the agency's erstwhile director, who, following their refusal to confirm in the Senate the appointment of his protege R. Grey as deputy director of the agency, accused the hawks of sabotaging any talks.

Official Washington is now explaining Rostow's dismissal in terms of the need to regularize the arms control decisionmaking process, which is now to come under the State Department's jurisdiction. Administration spokesmen are saying, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, that E. Rostow's dismissal "is aimed at ending the disorder and chaos which reigns among officials working in this sphere."

Judging from the statements of R. Reagan and Secretary of State G. Shultz, the White House has no intention as yet of reviewing its stance, currently aimed at achieving a one-sided military advantage. on matters relating to nuclear arms control.

Rostow's fall from grace, local observers point out, reflects the general crisis in the country after 2 years of Republican rule and, above all, the failure of its economic and social policy -- the so-called "Reaganomics."

It is becoming obvious to an increasing number of politicians, public figures and experts that the only way to get the economy back on its feet is to reduce the colossal appropriations for nuclear arms systems costing billions of dollars. But, as Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger said last week, his department has no intention of laying a finger on the country's nuclear "rearmament" program.

The dangerous militarist policy is provoking mounting opposition on the part of sober-minded America. Within the last few days a series of resolutions calling on the administration to take constructive steps to control nuclear arms has been submitted for Congress' examination. Legislators E. Markey and C. Zablocki, for example, have called on their colleagues to take another ballot supporting the idea of freezing U.S. and USSR nuclear arsenals. As we know, owing to crude pressure from the administration a similar initiative failed last year by a margin of just two votes.

Congressman T. Weiss submitted in turn a draft resolution calling on the White House to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons, as the Soviet Union is urging. As Weiss put it, by refusing to make this pledge the Republican administration plans to move still further toward building up its capability to fight a nuclear war -- a capability which is, in T. Weiss' view, offensive rather than defensive in nature. Congressmen also called on the administration to resume the talks on a complete and comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban which were broken off through the fault of the United States.

A number of observers also link Rostow's dismissal with certain differences of opinion within the administration on how to react to the latest peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet leaders and in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact states. Will Washington be able to grasp the realities of the nuclear age when the latest round of infighting has ended? Time will tell.

Radio Comment

LD281506 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 28 Jan 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Georgiy Alekseyev]

[Text] Proceedings have begun in the U.S. Congress to endorse the candidate for chief of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This job was previously held by Eugene Rostow who was removed by President Reagan. Kenneth Adelman has now been nominated as his successor. Up to now he has been deputy to U.S. representative at the United Nations Kirkpatrick. Political observers have noted that Eugene Rostow's resignation was being sought by the most reactionary politicians in Reagan's entourage. In fact, Rostow himself represents the right wing of the Democratic Party and is renowned as an adherent to the policy of acting from positions of strength. In particular, he was one of the founders of the Committee on the Present Danger, which was formed to combat the conclusion of a strategic arms limitation treaty. The [words indistinct] of the former chief of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was merely that he proposed moving from Reagan's so-called zero option at the Geneva talks. His resignation followed promptly, and confirmed the often expressed view that the Reagan administration is not yet interested in any turnabout in the Soviet-American talks on nuclear weapons in Europe.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD301755 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0945 GMT 30 Jan 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program presented by Gennadiy Vedenyapin, all-union radio foreign political observer, with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board, and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, KOMMUNIST international observer]

Reaction to Prague Meeting

[Text] [Vedenyapin] The preservation of peace and halting the arms race are a cardinal issue in international policy, and for this very reason the peace initiatives of the USSR and the other socialist countries proposed in Comrade Andropov's recent speeches and in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member-states remain to this day at the center of world policy.

There are now few factors which explain the heightened interest in the initiatives made by our country and its allies. First of all, this interest is clearly explained by the constructive and life-affirming nature of these proposals. On the other hand, in the conditions of the present difficult world situation world public opinion is reacting with heightened acuteness to our initiatives. Finally, the antiwar and antinuclear movement in West Europe, the United States, Japan, and other states, which has grown at an unprecedented rate, stimulates this same natural attention to the proposals of the USSR and the countries allied with it.

The profoundly well-argued nature of the proposals of the USSR and the other Warsaw Treaty member-states, their good reasoning and the account they rightfully take of the just interests of the security of all interested parties have had such a powerful effect that the conclusion is gradually being reached in political and government circles in the West European states that the United States must alter its prospectless position in regard to reaching agreement -- its prospectless position, that is, in the negotiations with the Soviet Union.

As the CPSU Central Committee Politburo stressed when assessing the results of Comrade Gromyko's recent visit to the FRG and the GDR, the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union on reducing nuclear arms in Europe are meeting with an increasing response in European countries, including the FRG.

[Volkskiy] In this regard the document published by the Social Democratic Party of Germany, essentially its preelection program, is particularly interesting. What this points out is that the disarmament negotiations, in particular those on reducing nuclear weapons in Europe, must include all nuclear weapons deployed in Europe and targeted on Europe. Where the issue of balance between East and West is concerned, the document of West German Social Democrats underscores, all nuclear weapons must be taken into consideration, including the French and British.

A 2-day conference of representatives of socialist and social democratic parties from Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark and Norway has taken place. They advocated that positive results be reached at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe; and the participants at the conference also stressed that the new Soviet proposals in this sphere would promote further progress at these negotiations.

The American position, however, provides for the so-called zero option -- which, as you know, comrade listeners, is aimed at attaining U.S. military superiority. This zero option, or pseudo-zero option, is described as unrealistic.

[Vedenyapin] Incidentally, Dmitriy Antonovich, Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, speaking at this same meeting of representatives of socialist and social democratic parties of several European countries, quite rightly said that peace can indeed be attained through negotiations and not through belligerent statements.

[Nekrasov] You have been speaking about the events of last week, naturally enough. I would like to look at these events, however, from a somewhat broader perspective. After all, a month has passed since our proposals and the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee were submitted. This month has demonstrated that these proposals have exerted a very great influence on the basic nerve center of the present international situation. Indeed there is only one such center, which is the complicated and dangerous nature of the international situation today. The presence of such danger is now admitted all over the world.

When saying that something may happen today or tomorrow, of course, what is meant in fact is that the current year will be of decisive signifiance -- could be of decisive signifiance -- in the development of the total international situation in the future. It is becoming clear to millions of people that the events to take place during the current year will determine whether it will be possible to end the trend toward further exacerbation of tension, a most dangerous trend since it can lead to a worldwide nuclear disaster. So it is considered literally all over the world that the New Year should make it clear if mankind has enough intelligence to overcome the growing danger.

The socialist countries and other peace-loving states in this instance are adopting a stance which is quite clear, unambiguous and obvious. They are in command of enough material and spiritual power to enable them to defend the future of mankind.

However, it should not be forgotten that much depends on the opposite side. In history there have been many madmen capable of starting worldwide conflagrations, going against common sense, thus condemning millions of people to suffering. This is the essence of the main issue today: Such madmen must not be permitted freedom of action. This is the issue of utmost importance today.

[Vedenyapin] Vadim Nikolayevich, in this connection it might be interesting to look into just how the proposals made by the socialist countries are viewed and assessed in the West, now after some time has passed, allowing for a thorough evaluation of the proposals and for drawing certain conclusions.

Of course, interest is primarily centered on the reaction coming from the United States. For instance, there were reports that in the White House intentions were being expressed on analyzing thoroughly and carefully the proposals submitted by the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries. On the other hand, the practical actions of the Reagan administration so far give no sign at all of any substantial positive conclusions. Is there anything of interest in this regard?

[Nekrasov] To answer your question, it is indeed an important and interesting question. I would like to begin with an assessment of public feeling and movement in America as seen by American journalists. An interesting example is a recent article in THE LOS ANGELES TIMES by a leading observer of this newspaper. The article begins by saying that the Soviet leader has been able to transfer the whole issue of armaments control from the diplomacy conference chambers shrouded in secrecy in Geneva into the open court of Western public opinion which is fluctuating in its moods. As regards the instability of these moods, of course, this is a tribute to official propaganda. In fact, there is a very stable majority in public opinion in favor of peace, as is clearly shown in numerous polls. But the main thing is, as the observer admits, that the peace-loving initiatives of the Soviet Union, of the Warsaw Treaty, were a master stroke by Moscow.

Afterward the State Department started persuading the White House of the need for giving the impression of greater flexibility in its response to the Soviet ideas. The White House began tentatively to adopt a more conciliatory stance. Here I was quoting this American journalist.

Now let me add: Regrettably this conciliatory stance that he mentions did not go beyond just a few words regarding the possibility of getting around the conference table with the Soviet Union. Even this was to be on the understanding, as they say, that the Soviet Union will make certain concessions on familiar issues such as Afghanistan, Poland and so forth. These are old-fashioned propaganda tricks. All this is, as Shakespeare says, just words, words, words.

Resumption of Arms Talks

[Volskiy] Vadim Nikolayevich, during last week, as reported, following the Christmas and New Year break, the Soviet-American talks on medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe resumed in Geneva. At the very moment when these talks were resuming, Rostow, the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, was removed from office, and was replaced by Kenneth Adelman who has, it is true, still to obtain the Senate's approval. This still quite young man already has a very clear political reputation: the reputation of a rightwing figure, even a figure close to the extreme rightwing. During the Senate hearing it became clear that he knows very little about the problems of disarmament; he understands very little about these matters. It seems that this was not considered to be all that important. Something else was seen to be more important: that in his published works Adelman directly and unambiguously rejects totally the idea of concluding new agreements on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments and other agreements aimed at curbing the arms race with the Soviet Union, insofar as, to quote, formerly such agreements have not brought any advantage to the United States, in Adelman's view. This is the sort of person we have as the new director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[Vedenyapin] Incidentally, Dmitriy Antonovich, if we return to Adelman himself he is, as far as I know, a member of the so-called Committee on the Present Danger in the United States. This organization is clearly rightwing and it stubbornly continues to consider that the Soviet Union possesses some kind of military advantage over the United States and that the United States should thus arm itself, upgrade its armaments, and so forth. Incidentally, such a propaganda research organization as the so-called Heritage Foundation is very close in its links and attitudes to this same Committee on the Present Danger.

Highly sympomatic in characterizing the attitudes in Washington is a report published by the Heritage Foundation. The report is entitled "Agenda for 1983: the Leadership's Mandate." This agenda looks exactly like good wishes for a continuation of the arms race. In this respect, indeed, we should remember that in its 20-volume report which it put on President Reagan's desk back when he was new to his post, the Heritage Foundation recommended that the military budget, the Pentagon's budget, be increased annually by $30-$35 billion. In general, Washington is still intending to follow this risky course.

[Nekrasov] That is quite right. At present, there are, for example, reports that Nitze was firmly told: No compromises; carry out your instructions and do not depart from them in the slighest. Indeed, it is in accordance with these instructions that the fresh stage of the talks in beginning. Thus THE NEW YORK TIMES was right a few days ago when it wrote that the American delegation is returning to Geneva with an empty portfolio and unchanged positions. Another point is that the tone of remarks from official Washington itself has even changed of late.

Here, for instance, is what the Baltimore newspaper, THE SUN, had to say about this the other day. It said that, aware of the danger that has come about, Reagan is trying to placate the allies by promises to weigh all the Soviet proposals; however, the fact that the change in the administration's tone has produced almost no effect makes it possible to judge the depth of alarm that has seized the Europeans and even certain officials in the American Administration.

[Vedenyapin] Vadim Nikolayevich, you have been speaking about the alarm among officials of the American Administration. As far as one knows, this alarm has to a considerable extent been aroused by reports from American embassies in many countries in Western Europe that speak of weakening support for American policy in West European countries. At least this is what the American newspapers are saying. What we have been hearing about the coming visit, which begins today, of U.S. Vice President George Bush to a number of West European countries, or about the creation in Washington of a high-level special propaganda committee on foreign policy issues, to judge from everything, confirms these reports.

One gets the impression that the American foreign policy course, which is directed at an ever greater increase in tension and at attempts to create a position of military superiority for America, is running up against ever-mounting resistance throughout the entire world. Naturally, Washington cannot ignore this fact.

[Nekrasov] What is interesting in this report about the establishment of this new group is the fact that it has become known that William Clark, the White House national security adviser, has been proposed as head of the committee at the Cabinet level, to promote, according to the report, the success of policies in the diplomatic, military and arms control fields.

That is, so to speak, what is being said officially. But what does this mean in actual fact? It obviously means recognition of the failures of American propaganda and of its inability to withstand the dissemination of the truth about the reality of American foreign policy regarding arms control, the arms race and so forth. Along with this committee a special planning group has also been set up, the participants of which will once again be the secretary of state, the defense secretary and the director of the U.S. Information Agency. This group is specifically to occupy itself with questions of disseminating the administration's policy on matters of strategic armaments, medium-range weapons in Europe, and so on. That is to say that a propaganda mechanism of the largest caliber is being set in motion. The creation of bodies at this level in itself shows how difficult the position of America's present policymakers has become. What is more, this position is not only difficult in the eyes of the rest of the world, but also in the United States itself.

You will have noted that a few days ago a group of 30 U.S. senators led by Edward Kennedy and Hatfield once again submitted a resolution to the Senate calling for a freeze on the nuclear arsenals of both the United States and the Soviet Union. This proposal, you will recall, received support in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. Let us also recall that last November, Kennedy and Hatfield submitted a similar sort of resolution to the U.S. Senate. At that time only two votes were needed to pass it and get it approved.

Mood in West Europe

[Volskiy] To round off this topic, Vadim Nikolayevich, we could mention the changes of mood we can see in West Europe. These changes, it is now evident, have to a considerable degree come to light under the influence of the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. In my view, the situation in the FRG is worthy of note. We have mentioned already the Social Democratic opposition and its program, but even the Kohl government, which has declared its full solidarity with Washington's position, apparently, is now beginning, well, if not exactly to dissociate itself gradually from such solidarity, at least to reserve a certain position for itself, and so forth.

[Nekrasov] Certainly, the FRG Government, the Kohl government you were talking about, virtually admitted a few days ago that the proposals for a zero option put foward by U.S. diplomacy cannot be maintained as the sole basis for the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons. Consequently it is necessary toexamine a series of other proposals.

This means, in essence, that the ruling party in Bonn is already denying Washington its 100-percent support for Washington's plans to deploy U.S. missiles in West Germany, something which just a few months ago it spoke quite definitely about. With regard to their opponents at the elections the Social Democrats, and their candidate for the chancellorship Hans-Jochen Vogel, state frankly that this party will take any possible step to avoid the deployment of the new missiles. It is interesting that even Strauss, that loyal knight of NATO, has recently spoken about the unrealistic nature of Reagan's zero option.

[Vedenyapin] In a word, Hunter, a former member of the National Security Council, was quite clearly right when he said that in the sphere of arms control the initiative lies without doubt with the Soviet Government. Further confirmation, so to speak, of this acknowledgement is another fact that has come to light only very recently and that bearswitness to the Soviet Union's continual readiness to respond in its turn to any reasonable initiative emanating from another side. I have in mind here the Soviet Union's reply to the Swedish Government's proposal for discussion of the issue -- discussion, rather, of its proposal to our country and other Warsaw Pact member-states and, of course, to member-countries of NATO, to establish in Europe a zone free of nuclear battlefield weapons of approximately 300 km wide. The Soviet side's reaction to this is all the more significant in that the Soviet Union not only gave its support to the Swedish proposal in principle, but for its own part took the initiative of developing it further; that is, the Soviet side agreed in principle to take part in negotiations of this sort, and suggested that such a proposed zone should be increased to 500-600 km, which would ensure, shall we say, in the event of such an agreement being reached, that it would be genuinely effective.

U.S.-Japanese Relations

[Volskiy] We have been speaking a great deal today about West Europe, where considerable changes really can be observed not only in the public's position but also in the position of many government circles in a whole series of countries. Unfortunately, however, the picture is rather different in Japan, where there is great discrepancy between public opinion and the government position. This has now become quite prominent especially in connection with the U.S.-Japanese sea and air maneuvers that are in progress despite widespread criticism in the Japanese press and from the anti-war movement in the country. Furthermore, these maneuvers gave practical evidence that the forthright statement by Prime Minister Nakasone during his recent visit in the United States, that Japan must become an unsinkable U.S. aircraft carrier, is not merely words. Recently he pursued the same thesis in parliament. His speech brought out sharp criticism even from the bourgeois press in Japan.

It must be said that there is great concern in other Asian countries too about this revival of Japanese militarism with American assistance. Concern is caused first of all by the decision that the Japanese will patrol the 1,000 mile maritime zone -- a zone defined by the Japanese premier himself as follows: from the island of Guam to Tokyo, from the Taiwan Strait to Osaka. But the press in Asian countries and in particular the newspapers in Malaysia last week went on to write that Japanese patrolling may extend also to the South China Sea and the Malacca Straits, foreseeing here Japanese ambitions for military dominance over key regions off the coast of the Asian Continent, especially close to the countries of Southeast Asia, over which Japan has long had designs for economic domination.

[Vedenyapin] Dmitriy Antonovich, it would be fair to say at this point that all this bears out the view put forward recently on many occasions that the Japanese ambition to flex more military muscle in Southeast Asia will not always coincide with U.S. interests.

[Volskiy] Yes, this is quite true. Indeed now the point of view and voices can be heard to the effect that, according to some observers, Nakasone and the circles behind him are rightwing nationalists merely making use of U.S. support, exploiting Washington's strategic self-interest for the purpose of bringing, as they say, Japan's military potential into line with its economic might. Should this objective of so-called correspondence be achieved, there is no telling just how Tokyo would behave either with regard to relations with the United States or on the world scene in general. But I believe that there is not much point now in peering that far into the future; concerning the situation today there is no doubt about the rightness for instance of what ASAHI says -- that the plans of the Nakasone government represent a united whole together with Reagan's military strategy in relation to the Soviet Union. It is not fortuitous that this newspaper reports a probing of the possibility for cooperation between Japan and the NATO bloc. It can only be added here that Japan is not alone is probing into this possibility -- there is also the tripartite alliance being created in the Far East with Japan's very active participation, the tripartite alliance between the United States, Japan and South Korea that is in fact turning into a sort of Far Eastern branch of the North Atlantic bloc.

However, the ruling circles in Japan are already demanding a high price for this playing along with the United States. In fact Tokyo is after a deal which would, in return for extensive participation in the global anti-Soviet military strategy of the Pentagon and NATO, ensure that the United States and other Western countries overlook the economic expensionism of Japanese capital.

[Nekrasov] We have been speaking about a whole range of negative phenomena and situations of recent days, and about the struggle between different tendencies -- but at the same time the main tendencies are continuing to function. I have in mind the struggle of progressive forces against reaction, the forward struggle we are witnessing in many parts of the world. In this connection there is a pleasing prospect, in my view, contained in the press reports about the onward actions and victories of the patriots in El Salvador.

Situation in Central America

[Volskiy] Yes, that is one aspect. However, there is another aspect to this situation too, which shows that the situation is not completely a simple one. For instance, the evacuation of the families of American diplomats and other staff from El Salvador was announced. This shows that the Americans are in some way preparing an opportunity for a broader and more direct participation by the United States, perhaps even for military intervention in that country and for interference in the civil war that is being waged there.

But as you, Vadim Nikolayevich rightly said, events are indeed developing there in such a way at present that the American proteges in that country have ever fewer possibilities with their own forces to suppress the national-liberation movement in El Salvador. They still do have certain reserves, but in general these reserves are dwindling. Their army is proving less capable of combat than the insurgent armed forces. This raises the question that the United States will definitely be considering the possibility, I think, of a direct intervention, which is shown by the decision to evacuate embassy personnel, or rather the diplomats' families, from El Salvador.

Let us not, of course, foreshadow the development of events in Central America. I would like to say that the Nicaraguan Government, the Salvadoran patriotic organizations and also certain other Latin American countries such as Mexico and Venezuela have been putting forward constructive and peace-loving programs for a solution of the situations of conflict in Central and South America was also advocated by the Prague declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member-states.

If at present there is no success in achieving such a settlement, it is a matter first and foremost of U.S. global imperialist aspirations, which has now created a fresh hotbed of military tension in Central America.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, if we look at the whole complex of the facts and happenings about which we have been speaking in our program today, the need for the development of a peaceful dialogue toward mutual understanding and the achievement of sensible agreements becomes even clearer. The strategy of force and the strategy of fear have already proven to be bankrupt.

In one of his recent statements Foreign Minsiter Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko said: We are convinced that the logic of fear and force is fallacious, and that the security of each of the sides and of the world as a whole must not be built on fear of a striving for military superiority. A striving toward agreements and mutual trust should be a steadfast and determining motive in relations between states. Indeed, the dialectics of the present age -- the dialectics of the present nuclear space age -- dictates the insistent need to achieve the type of agreements that would lead to a curbing of the arms race and a lowering of the level of danger of military confrontation. This thought is also stressed in the Prague declaration of the Warsaw Pact member-states, which says that it is necessary to act without delay and while there is still a possibility of curbing the arms race and adopting disarmament.

Here, comrades, we come to the end of our roundtable talk today. We thank you for your attention. Until we meet again on the air.

MOSCOW TV'S 29 JANUARY 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW301430 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 0809 GMT 29 Jan 83

["Studio 9" program moderated by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, consultant of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, and Colonel General Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center for our monthly discussion of the situation taking shape in the international arena. Well, first of all I would like to introduce the guests of our program today: Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, consultant of the CPSU Central Committee, and Col Gen Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Froces.

Pact Arms Control Proposals

Of course it will be no exaggeration if we state that the complex of proposals directed at finally bringing the arms race under control, which has reached dangerous proportions, and the slipping of the world to a dangerous brink today bears very much on the course of the process in the international arena. We are talking precisely about interconnected complex proposals which, as I have said, were proposed in the report on the 60th anniversary of the formation of the Soviet Union delivered by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the Political Declaration adopted by the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact countries held recently in Prague and in speeches by a number of Soviet leaders. These proposals contain constructive interconnected ideas, ideas that can substantially improve the current international situation if our partners in the talks regard them thoughtfully and constructively. Therefore, it is quite natural if we begin our talk today with these proposals, with their essence, and how these proposals have been received in the West. Nikolay Vladimirovich, I would like to ask you to do this.

[Shishlin] Well, if we sum it up, the essence of the reactions in the West to our proposals consist of the fact that hope for a turn for the better has sprung up. And this hope is, of course, connected with the constructive nature of the initiatives by both the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact members -- and I would like to add that this hope is also connected with the well thought out nature of these initiatives.

It seems that a common understanding is arising: that dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States and between the socialist and capitalist states is indespensable. In particular, this common understanding also concerns such a major proposal of the Warsaw Pact members as the proposal on concluding a treaty between the NATO member-states and Warsaw Pact member-states, on concluding -- excuse me for repeating myself -- a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations.

However, the matter does not only lie in conducting a dialogue -- essentially a dialogue exists. Even the United States, one can say, has not broken off the dialogue with our country, literally for even one day. But, after all, a dialogue is not conducted for the dialogue's sake. The essence of the ideas (?and) initiatives proposed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries consists of making the dialogue yield results, to reach decisions which would meet the interests of peace and international security relations. And I would like to note that behind these proposals there is, you know, the practical results of the work of the Political Consultative Committee, and not only the work of the Political Consultative Committee but, namely, the unity of the socialist countries, and the better coordination of their actions in international affairs.

I think that in this sense it is symptomatic that the purposeful line of the Warsaw Pact members also consists of consolidating mutual relations with other socialist states. This concerns Cuba; this concerns Mongolia; this concerns Vietnam and Laos. There are large reserves in the developing relations with the DPRK; and of course a notable point in contemporary international life is a certain movement [podvizhka] in Soviet-Chinese relations and the forthcoming resumption of Soviet-Chinese political consultations.

Now in connection with this, I would like to note that I doubt whether anyone would argue that complications in Soviet-Chinese relations are by no means assets for peace. And it seems what may be called a movement [podvizhka] in our relations, the beginning of businesslike talks and the beginning of constructive talks should be welcome everywhere. However, it is far from everywhere that we receive such favorable responses. In particular, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, who is getting ready to visit Japan and China, will, according to an assessment by his Japanese colleague, the Japanese minister of foreign affairs, Abe, be talking about how to avert Soviet-Chinese rapprochement.

However, returning to the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee and to those ideas expressed by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, it should be said that the pivot of those proposals -- and their counterpoint in a way -- is the problem of disarmament, the problem of limiting and curtailing the arms race, and first and foremost nuclear arms in Europe.

This is the most sensitive problem, sensitive for all. Will the world pay more and more in order to become more and more fragile? That is the question. You know that various types of observations, many observations, are being expressed by the West concerning our concrete ideas on this.

In particular, they are saying specifically that the Soviet idea aimed at sharply curtailing nuclear arms in Europe, including strategic arms, is not indisputable by virtue of the fact that the Soviet Union, in reaching agreement with the United States, proposes taking into consideration the British and French nuclear forces which -- as they try to depict them not only in Washington but in Paris and London as well -- are some kind of inconsequential thing and a minimal element in the present distribution of military forces which can be simply forgotten today.

[Zorin] Yes. Well, of course, it is difficult for us to forget. The question arises that Britain and France do have missiles with nuclear warheads. Who are they aimed at? At Belgium or Holland? It is clear that we cannot fail to take this circumstance into account. Nikolay Fedorovich, I would like to ask you to dwell on this question.

[Chervov] British and French intermediate-range nuclear arms are quite substantial nuclear forces from the military viewpoint. All in all, they have about 260 missiles and [nuclear weapon] carrying aircraft. If one counts warheads, then just 162 British and French missiles can presently lift more than 300 nuclear warheads at one time and by 1985 it will be almost 600 warheads. These are not tactical nuclear weapons. They are capable of reaching as far as the Urals. Can this be ignored? Of course not. The Soviet Union has more than once explained at the very highest level that British and French nuclear weapons will not be considered at talks. We are not considering them and are not demanding their reduction. We demand that the U.S. side consider these British and French nuclear weapons in the sum total, in NATO's total balance.

[Zorin] Quite a logical formulation of the question.

[Chervov] This is undoubtedly a just viewpoint. You know that in the final analysis it makes no difference to the Soviet Union whose flag covers these or those nuclear weapons. British and French nuclear arms are part of NATO's military potential and present a threat to objects on the territory of the USSR and other socialist countries and, as the American themselves say, these nuclear weapons are meant to supplement U.S. forward-based nuclear means.

U.S. Response, Strength Viewed

[Zorin] Nikolay Fedorovich, another question for you. You know that the Soviet Union displayed an extremely important initiative in declaring that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons. Washington did not follow up on this initiative which, of course, cannot fail to affect the international situation. What, from your viewpoint as a military man, is the matter? Why does Washington take this position?

[Chervov] You see, Valentin Sergeyevich, one should bear in mind the following: The leaders of the current U.S. Administration more than once frankly declared that the United States will not hesitate to use military force, including nuclear weapons, in solving international problems. Quite recently, General Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander, reaffirmed in an interview with the West German newspaper DIE WELT, I quote: That the U.S. and NATO countries will not hesitate to be first to use nuclear weapons if we -- that is the United States -- deem it necessary. It is written in black and white in contemporary U.S. regulations that the United States will in all probability be the first to use tactical nuclear weapons in accordance with predetermined plans worked out beforehand. I think there is no need to explain what that means. We are talking about preparing armed forces for a nuclear attack and morally educating servicemen for nuclear aggression.

[Shishlin] Incidentally, Valentin Sergeyevich, since you asked Nikolay Fedorovich the question about the Soviet Union's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, then we should also now talk about the fact that the Soviet Union -- and this is obvious from the Political Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee -- is prepared to negotiate with NATO on the nonuse of either nuclear or conventional weapons first, and generally on the nonuse of military force as such.

[Zorin] Well, as follows from what Nikolay Fedorovich just said, the Americans for the present are displaying a desire to solve problems in words only, but are acting in quite another direction. Well, another question Nikolay Fedorovich, I would like to broach one more aspect of the problem. One of the West's arguments with which they conceal their unwillingness to make a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is the thesis that the Warsaw Pact countries, they say, have a superiority in conventional arms. There is such a thesis.

[Chervov] Valentin Sergeyevich, this thesis does not correspond with reality and this was convincingly demonstrated in the interview Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, gave to a TASS correspondent. According to the basic indicators, the real picture is as follows: The NATO bloc (?surpasses) the Warsaw Pact in the overall number of personnel, in the number of combat-ready divisions, in antitank means and has approximately an equal number of artillery and armored equipment. NATO is somewhat inferior to the Warsaw Pact in the number of tactical aircraft. But on the whole an approximate balance of forces exists in conventional armed forces.

As a professional soldier who studies this problem, I would like to tell you that no comprehensive analysis exists in NATO calculations on comparison of conventional forces. In particular, the human resources of NATO and the Warsaw Pact are not taken into account: The armed forces of France and Spain are excluded from the calculations; the armed forces remaining under the authority of national commands are not shown; stored arms... [corrects himself] stored reserves of arms and equipment are not taken into account; and moreover data on the armed forces of Warsaw Pact countries are obviously overstated. Thus a distorted picture of the correlation of forces results.

[Zorin] Well then, there is an obvious juggling taking place and.... [interrupted]

[Shishlin] Yes, and incidentally, just in January, we heard a lot about this, that the West, well primarily the United States, continued attempts at popularizing the thesis that the Soviet proposals and the ideas of other socialist countries on disarmament are propaganda. I would like to say that they are not propaganda but policies, and it is doubtful whether even Reagan could deny the real interest of our country and other socialist countries in curtailing the arms race. It is no accident that he often slips in the canard [syuzhetets], that, supposedly, arms and defense expenditures are such a burden for the Soviet Union, which will, in the final analysis, compel our country to reconcile itself with the U.S. achieving military superiority or attaining the same military superiority only at a lower level. [Dostizheniye togo zhe samogo voyennogo prevoskvodstua lish na boleye nizkikh urovnyakh]

One must sincerely say that it is, of course, extremely complicated for our party to transfer a portion of the national income to defense needs and probably many of our difficult problems would have become things of the past if it were not for those foreign policy conditions in which our country and our allies have to work. It is the current U.S. administration which cuts tens of billions of dollars from social expenditure items with a stroke of the pen and transfers them to so-called rearmament [dovooryzheniye]. This is not simple for us. However, one must say in all honesty, that the Soviet Union will not play giveaway [poddavki] with the United States, and the Americans know that behind the words of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Andropov, that we will respond to the U.S. MX and cruise missiles with analogous arms. They know perfectly well that real actions lie behind these words.

[Zorin] On the other hand, I think that in the White House they now regret that a term like Reaganomics was coined. The President really linked his name to his economic course too much, and now it turns out that these enormous military expenditures, with whose help they wanted to bend the Soviet Union, have for the present placed the U.S. Administration in an extremely difficult position. This is one of the biggest failures of this administration and now they would probably give a lot in the White House if the current failures in the government's economic policies were not linked with the name of the current President, with this very Reaganomics.

Well, let us return to the problem we are discussing. Nikolay Fedorovich, I want to ask you yet another question in connection with those subjects which are being examined. It is known that in Washington, expecially during the tenure of the current Reagan Administration, they began talking about the possibility of limited nuclear war and protracted nuclear war. These were not just correspondents and journalists, these were declarations by high-ranking figures in the administration.... [interrupted]

[Chervov] Yes.

[Zorin] Now, as a military man, please answer the question: Is the possibility of a limited or protracted nuclear war real?

[Chervov] A limited nuclear war is an illusion. There can be no limited nuclear war. If a nuclear war broke out in Europe or in another region of the world, it would inevitably assume a universal character. Such is the logic of war itself. What does limited signify? Let us digress and discuss it from a military viewpoint.

This means, in fact, several hundred or at least a few dozen nuclear strikes. Can one imagine that, in this event, the other side would sit and scrupulously count. I have been hit with, lets say, 80 strikes, therefore I too must also deliver 80 strikes? Well, theoretically, anything may be discussed. However, on a practical plane, besides in wartime, under conditions when there would be a breakdown in communications and control systems, it is unreal, it is a fantasy to calculate that the enemy would deliver the same number of strikes as I delivered on him. The U.S. theory of limited nuclear war proceeds from a false understanding of the essence of the matter and the desire to make the very idea of nuclear war acceptable to public opinion. To instill in people that supposedly a nuclear conflict could be limited within some sort of framework.... [interrupted]

[Shishlin] Not only limited within some sort of framework, but also in specific zones.

[Chervov] Yes.

[Shishlin] Excluding the United States.

[Chervov] Such a theory has nothing in common with reality and only deludes people. This is dangerous. One should proceed not from the possibility of a limited nuclear conflict, but in all cases firmly and quite definitely from the unacceptability and intolerability of such a conflict.

[Zorin] Well, it seems that a protracted nuclear war is also untenable.

[Chervov] Yes, quite right.

Geneva Talks

[Zorin] The Soviet-American talks in Geneva are being resumed, talks that have a direct bearing on the topic of our talk. This is attracting great attention in the international community, and the Soviet people are showing great interest in this. The mail received by "Studio 9" includes a lot of letters on this topic, and I would like to cite one of them.

We received it from Comrade Lebedeva, a physician by profession, who lives in Novosibirsk. She asks us to explain: What did the first round, the first part of the talks which has already been held, accomplish? In connection with this one cannot fail to notice the obvious difference in how the results of that part of the USSR-U.S. talks in Geneva, which have already been held, are being assessed -- the assessments made by our side and the assessments made in Washington. They have been assessed very differently. Nikolay Vladimirovich, what is the matter here?

[Shishlin] Well, it seems to me that Washington's official optimism resembles a kind of fancy wrapping, if you will, for bad goods. Generally, these talks are confidential in nature and it is probably not worth making any particularly detailed and substantial comments on what is occurring in the framework of these talks. In the long run, the details of the talks do not change the overall characteristics of the situation.

The official purpose of Washington's optimism, it seems to me, lies in reassuring the U.S. and West European public. After all, the essence of the matter is that according to Reagan, the path toward agreement does not lie through reasonable compromises, nor through strict adherence to the principles of equality and identical security, but, as he has himself said, through the use of means for applying pressure [sredstva davleniya] and determination.

Under the means for applying pressure, he sees all those American programs of rearmament [dovooruzheniye] and the modernization of the strategic triad; while under determination, he means the well-known shakeup of the entire U.S. team with which our representatives met in Geneva. Besides, the shakeup is characteristic in the sense that even Rostow, who essentially led this entire team, did not, as it turned out, possess sufficient determination from the point of view of the White House boss.

[Zorin] Despite the fact that it was the same Rostow who was one of the initiators of the burial of the SALT II agreement.

[Shishlin] Yes, SALT II. And it appears that Washington just cannot bring itself to take a look at the real state of affairs, and does not want to assess the real picture of the world which is taking shape and changing, and by no means in accordance with Washington's directions. And in the present case I would like to recall -- now I have just heard what Nikolay Fedorovich had to say about a so-called limited nuclear war or a rational one -- the words of Nikolay Mikhailovich Karamzin, our historian. He wrote that history is not a novel. Lies can always be beautiful. But the truth in its plain attire only pleases some minds -- experienced and mature minds.

This is precisely why we say that today the U.S. optimism is false in nature. Today, the talks are simply a screen for it and essentially the first round of the talks concluded with nothing.

Is a change in the American position possible? It is possible, of course it is possible. Everything changes. Possibly the American position will change too.

[Chervov] I would like to add a little here. In my opinion Washington is presently leading the public around by the nose on questions of disarmament.

Washington is presently laying stress on propaganda and attempting to create the impression among the U.S. public and the public of Western Europe that allegedly the White House is striving towards understandings with the intractable Soviets, the intractable Russians. But the main thing for Washington is to present its line at the talks in an advantageous light and to divert criticism from itself.

But what is the essence of this position? If the permit, let us have a look at what is represented ... [corrects himself] what proposal is presently being made by the Americans at the strategic arms talks. I will dwell on this briefly.

[Zorin] Please.

[Chervov] The fault for the lack of progress, both at the strategic arms talks and at the intermediate-range nuclear arms reduction talks, falls entirely on the American side. Let us take the strategic arms talks. What is the United States proposing? Virtually a selective reduction of strategic arms: For example, it proposes that the ballistic arms of both sides be reduced to an 850-unit level. At first glance, it appears that here we have equality on both sides and a cardinal reduction. But this is only at first glance.

The final result is as follows: There would be approximately 1,400 carriers in the U.S. strategic forces while the USSR would have 1.5 times less carriers. The United States would get a threefold advantage in the number of nuclear charges, and the growth of its nuclear potential can be demonstrated on this graph. [Chervov holds up a graph headlined "Nuclear Potential of U.S. Strategic Offensive Forces." It shows that the United States had 5,000 warheads in 1960; 5,100 in 1970; "about 10,000" in 1980 and will have "about 20,000" in 1990] As you can see, by 1990 the strategic forces would grow in terms of nuclear warheads to 20,000 units.

But this is not all. If we talk in simple human terms then the United States is proposing that the Soviet Union scrap both its strategic land-based and its naval missiles, and that instead of them the Soviet Union will have precisely the same number and the same correlation of land-based and naval missiles -- of the same weight and type and with the same number of warheads -- as the American side has. Besides, nearly 600 heavy bombers, armed with long-range cruise missiles on the U.S. side, would remain untouched.

I do not think one needs to be a specialist to see that the U.S. position on limiting strategic arms is illogical and unrealistic.

The same thing can also be said about limiting intermediate-range nuclear arms. The United States is presently sticking to its zero option. It is attempting to prove that the Soviet Side has about 1,000 intermediate-range nuclear means while the United States and NATO have only zero. Therefore, it says the USSR must reduce all of its intermediate-range missiles, otherwise the United States will deploy an additional 572 missiles in Western Europe.

We are talking about an ultimatum, about the unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union. The United States and NATO do not want to reduce even one missile nor a single aircraft. The question arises: What about the forward-based nuclear means? The nuclear means of Britain and France? After all, in this case the correlation of military forces will be upset in favor of the United States and NATO. Now this picture shows that presently there is a correlation of one to one. [A diagram is shown on the screen headlined "correlation of NATO and USSR Intermediate-Range Means." It shows that the USSR has 975 while NATO has 986 intermediate-range means. The USSR's means are broken down into 461 aircraft and 514 missiles, while NATO's means are broken down into British and French means of 161 missiles and 101 aircraft and U.S. means of 723 aircraft.

Well now, it is really hard to imagine how many dollars and how many words, even the most cleverest of words, are needed to present black as white and white as black.

[Zorin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, you have correctly drawn attention to the duplicity of the American position. On the one hand there are various hints and half hints or a desire to preserve freedom of action to possibly change the position in Geneva, while on the other hand there are completely concrete actions, completely definite directions.... [interrupted]

[Shishlin] And time, time is moving on in this regard.

[Zorin] Yes. Well, I have to say that quite concrete political circumstances are reflected by this sort of novelty, perhaps, of Washington's reaction. Indeed, previously any Soviet proposal received a "no." Sometimes even before they became familiar with it firsthand in the White House, simply on the basis of press agency reports. Now, when this complex or recent proposals was made, such a categorical "no" was not forthcoming, but there were some evasive formulations: We need to think it over, we need to discuss it. And I think this is connected on the one hand with foreign policy circumstances, of course, certain sentiments, in Western Europe in particular. These public sentiments also affect the position of the governments which are NATO partners of the United States, and Washington has to somehow take this into consideration, although it very much does not want to take this into account. Strictly speaking, that is why Bush is going. On the other hand, internal policy matters in the United States have also had an effect.

Now, 2 years of Reagan's term have passed. In the United States, they say that the presidency, the 4-year presidential term, is divided into two parts. The first part is when the president can engage in politics, while the second is when the president is already preparing for elections.

Indeed, quite definite measures in the regular election preparation campaign were already begun in January. The Reagan administration completed the first part of its term with an unprecedented deficit, both in the international arena and within the country. And generally the Republican Party and its leaders are quite obviously concerned over whether the party will be able to retain power in the 1984 elections. Taking into account that antiwar sentiments are growing, not only in Western Europe but within the United States itself, the Republicans and President Reagan want to appear somehow more presentable, perhaps, in particular where the Soviet proposals are concerned. Perhaps this, to a known extent, explains some of these fresh nuances in Washington's reactions to the Soviet proposals.

U.S. Military Preparations

Well, Nikolay Vladimirovich, you have already mentioned a number of concrete actions which nevertheless indicate that Washington for the present is continuing its former line. Perhaps you, Nikolay Fedorovich, have something to add in this regard.

[Chervov] Well, what can be added? Under cover of talks, the United States is now conducting military preparations in almost all regions of the world, including the Near East, the Middle East and the Far East. As an example, one can cite the formation of a new command by the U.S. Armed Forces in the Middle and Near East, the so-called Centcom. I will show you a map which can also be displayed for our television viewers. Centcom, the U.S. Central Military Command, was formed on 1 January; it began operating from 1 January 1983. [A map of the Middle and Near East is shown on the screen marking U.S. bases in the region. A headline on the map reads: "Zone of Operations of the Central Military Command of the U.S.A. (Centcom). A table of strength is superimposed over the Indian Ocean above Diego Garcia] The Near and Middle East and east Africa come into the zone of this command's operations -- altogether 19 states, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea and a significant portion of the Indian Ocean.

[Additionally, the missiles and aircraft on the NATO side are identified. The identification of British and French means are mostly indistinct while U.S. aircraft are identified as FB-111, F-111, F-4, A-6 and A-7.] Now if we do not consider the forward-based nuclear means and reduce all Soviet missiles, then it turns out to be about two to one in favor of NATO in terms of carriers, and nearly 2.5 times in favor of NATO in terms of nuclear warheads.

And now in response to your question, Valentin Sergeyevich, why are the sides, in other words the Soviet Union and the United States, assessing the state of affairs at the talks differently? The United States says that the talks are progressing successfully, that there is progressive movement forward; while the Soviet Union says that presently the position is deadlocked, that no success has been achieved.

I would like to cite the Assistant Secretary of State Burt, who in September said the following before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: If we had not begun the talks with the Russians it would have been impossible to force the allies to agree to the deployment of missiles on their territory. It was essential for us, Burt said, to create the impression, I repeat, to create the impression among the allies that we, that is the United States, are seriously striving for progress in the matter of nuclear arms reduction.

To substantiate their zero [option] they are now citing many false arguments, let us assume the following arguments: that the Soviet Union is allegedly building additional depots for nuclear and chemical weapons on GDR territory, that the Soviet Union is allegedly building up its nuclear arms on GDR territory, that the Soviet Union has allegedly carried out an SS-20 missile test over a distance of 8,000 kilometers, and so forth. All of this is untrue. Disinformation has only one aim: to attempt to prove the necessity for the rearmament of Western Europe. A tactic of constructive inactivity on the part of the United States is concealed behind a semblance of a businesslike approach.

[Zorin] To this may be added that not everything depends on Washington. The determination of Washington today to block progress at the talks is one thing, while the situation which is taking shape in reality that can force Washington to behave differently is another.

[Shishlin] At this round of the talks the Americans will attempt to grasp at the zero option. But, it seems to me, there is also something symptomatic in the fact that when answering a question at one of his recent press conferences concerning the U.S. zero option and the possibility of deviating from it, Reagan said the following: Here you are intruding dangerously into a field which should not be subject to discussion, namely the tactics and strategy of conducting the talks. If we begin discussing this openly, Reagan continued, then there will be no strategy, and what will happen is that our hands will be prematurely tied in relation to any possibility of achieving something.

Though it is not clear to me what this has to do with strategy, this kind of tactic is sufficiently transparent. A similar question was put to Nitze before his return to Geneva. He is the American representative who is conducting the talks on nuclear arms in Europe. He simply refused to reply to this question.

Now there are, nonetheless, certain tangible things which the United States is undertaking. In particular the United States has decided to send Vice President Bush to Western Europe. During 12 days he will visit seven West European capitals. By a presidential decision two new committees have been established in Washington. Well, their task is to respond with energetic counterpropaganda measures to the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other participants in the Warsaw Treaty. Concretely, we are talking about the formation of the so-called new interdepartmental group which will be headed by Clark, the President's national security adviser. Now in the current financial year, $20 million is being earmarked for these groups while in the next financial year, they want to set aside $65 million for their activities.

The purpose of the formation of this command is quite clear. It is the building up of military preparations for interfering into the affairs of sovereign states of this region. Well, this undoubtedly presents a definite threat to the Soviet Union and will require corresponding attention on our part.

Moreover, in the Far East, too. The United States is now also conducting active military preparations in the Far East. Here I can cite certain concrete facts, Permanent basing of two squadrons of F-16 aircraft is planned. These are figher-bombers with a range of more than 1,000 kilometers. There will be a total of 48 aircraft on Japanese territory. Aircraft deployed in South Korea are also being replaced by U.S. F-16 aircraft. Two battleships -- the New Jersey and the Iowa -- have been returned to the complement of the U.S. 7th Fleet. Here I have photographs of these battleships. You may see them. [A photograph of the USS New Jersey appears on the screen followed by a photograph of the USS Iowa] They have now been demothballed, and will be...[corrects himself] they are intended for, and will be permanently stationed in, Japanese ports. The battleships will be equipped with long-range cruise missiles -- 32 cruise missiles on each battleship. The cruise missile has a range of 2,500 kilometers and carries a nuclear warhead with a yield of 200 kilotons.

Moreover, the forced militarization of Japan is underway under pressure from the United States. Expenditures for maintaining U.S. bases on Japanese territory have been increased. The Japanese fleet and Air Force are being enlisted to facilite U.S. communications in a 1,000-mile zone. Military preparations are being intensified in Japan itself. Consent has been given to transfer new Japanese technology for the production of U.S. military equipment. Joint exercises by U.S., South Korean and Japanese forces are being conducted on a permament basis. Thus, one notices a closer coordination of Japanese military policy with U.S. global strategy. All these measures of the United States and Japan directly affect the interests of the Soviet Union's security in the Far East.

U.S. Relations With Allies

[Zorin] Well now, I think the fact is quite well-substantiated that we cannot pass by the circumstance about which Nikolay Fedorovich has spoken and to which he has drawn attention. It seems that in discussing the problem linked with the complex of recently-made Soviet proposals note should also be taken of the fact that the opponents of these proposals, who presently cannot speak out openly, who, taking into consideration the public mood, cannot venture to speak openly against these proposals, are employing all kinds of venomous versions. Among them, in particular, is a thesis in which they say that the Soviet Union is making its proposals not so much with the idea of ensuring security or reducing the arms race as with the idea of attempting to drive a wedge between the United States and its allies. Now, what do you think?

[Shishlin] Now, I think that everything here has been turned upside down because we do not conceal the fact that we indeed want cooperation with all countries who are prepared for such cooperation in the pursuit of peace. We do not shut the door on anyone, for talks and for dialogue, including the United States itself. And if some kind of political illustration of this is needed, then this is Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's recent visit to the FRG. As is known, the current leaders of that country generally are basically quite clearly aligned with Washington's position. However, after the visit, they also noted the sincere, constructive as well as beneficial character of the talks the Soviet minister of foreign affairs had in Bonn.

You know that is how matters stand not only in politics, but also in our economic cooperation with the FRG. It is now our number one trading partner in the West. Incidentally, this position quite recently, a number of years ago, was held by Japan. However, the political fads that are now making themselves felt ever more acutely in Japan have already relegated Japan to fifth place among the capitalist states trading with the Soviet Union.

I repeat, we are indeed striving for normal cooperation with the European countries regarding the question of who is forcing a wedge into the relations between the United States and the Europeans and between the United States and the Japanese, then of course the United States can find the culprits without going across the ocean or anyplace whatsoever. They can find these culprits at firsthand, on the banks of the Potomac, for its completely clear that the U.S. allies...[corrects himself] I did not mention the fact that Japan has moved, has fallen back to the fifth place in trade with our country by chance. You know that when the United States twists the arms of its partners, as occurred in connection with the well-known gastruby [gas pipeline] agreement, it is not, let us say, only in pursuit of political interests. Here, not only a desire to spoil things as far as possible for the Soviet Union can be seen. You see, the economic interest of U.S. companies also enter into this.

[Zorin] To supress partners and to suppress competitors.

[Shishlin] Yes, of course.

USSR 'Measures of Confidence'

[Zorin] Well, insofar as today, we are examining various aspects connected with the complex of Soviet proposals made recently, Nikolay Fedorovich. I would like to ask you to respond to a number of our television viewers who have sent letters to "Studio 9" asking for an explanation of what is meant by measures of confidence in the military sphere when we talk about... [corrects himself] when problems and the conclusions of agreements are discussed? What is meant here?

[Cherov] The Soviet Union proposed a whole complex of proposals on measures of strengthening confidence in the military sphere. In the elaboration of the Helsinki Act, these measures of confidence envisaged: notification of large-scale military exercises, of large-scale movements of forces, of large-scale naval and air force exercises; limiting the scale of exercises and the participation of not more than 40-50,000 men in them.

The Soviet Union has declared its readiness to extend the measures of confidence in the entire European part of its territory. Concrete proposals on measures for strengthening confidence have now been advanced by the Soviet side at the Geneva talks. What do we have in mind? To ban heavy bomber flights and aircraft carrier navigation in agreed zones and regions. To establish missile-carrying submarine navigation zones and to give notification in good time about any launches of interncontinental ballistic missiles, except individual launches carried out inside Soviet territory. To give notification in good time about mass flights by heavy bombers and forward-based aircraft.

You know, I think it is clear to all that this complex of outlined measures is directed primarily at strengthening mutual understanding, strengthening confidence, at consolidating stability and, on the whole, at relaxing international tensions.

However, all these measures and other including those proposed by the United States, cannot solve the fundamental questions of disarmament. Therefore, measures of confidence should not be made in place of achieving agreements on real measures of curbing the arms race and lowering the level of military confrontation, first and foremost nuclear confrontation.

[Shishlin] Nikolay Fedorovich, definite measures of confidence are, of course, necessary in the political sphere because....[interrupted]

[Chervov] Mutual relations between states.

[Shishlin] Of course.

[Chervov] Mutual understanding between them.

[Shishlin] Of course. Because maintaining normal, proper interstate relations is of course, also a completely compulsory condition for the establishment of an atmosphere of confidence in international relations.

U.S. Criticisms

[Chervov] None other than the U.S. President, Ronald Reagan, gave a wonderful illustration of this state of affairs when at one of his recent press conferences, guided by some completely unknown U.S. journalist and a completely unknown American paper, he invented a certain ten commandments of Vladimir Ilich Lenin which contain -- according to either the journalist's or Reagan's interpretation -- the assertion that on the whole any morality is foreign to the Soviet Union and everything is justified for the success of the socialist cause.

However, I think that when one strives to build policies and relations on such false premises and such distortions and on such dense ignorance, if you will, then truly such an approach cannot be well-founded.

[Zorin] And does not increase confidence.

[Shishlin] Yes, of course. In this case, the approach crumbles. It constantly backfires, but this does not bring rejoicing, because Soviet-U.S. relations lose out and international relations generally lose out. A struggle of ideas is a struggle of ideas; and leaders and political forces are powerless to abolish this struggle of ideas. However, in the struggle of ideas the best weapon is, of course, honesty and fairness. We adhere to this point of view.

[Chervov] I would like to add a number of examples corroborating what Nikolay Vladimorovich has said, that indeed mutual understanding and confidence between the United States and the USSR and between some Western countries is now at a low level. Take, for example, these facts: The Soviet Union withdrew 20,000 men and 1,000 tanks from the GDR. In the West it was presented as a propaganda trick. Even more, they have started to declare that such a withdrawal has not occurred. We declared an intermediate-range arms freeze when the moratorium was announced. We are told that this is a trap of Moscow's and that this reinforces the superiority of the Russians. Even our unilateral reduction of intermediate-range missiles which we are now carrying out, even this was declared a deception by the West, including the United States. The Russians, they say, are not reducing anything, but on the contrary are increasing the number of their missiles.

[Shishlin] Although they know precisely that we are reducing them.

[Chervov] Undoubtedly, even our obligation not to use nuclear weapons first, the United States wants to distort even that. These are the examples of the low level of mutual understanding and of the mistrust between the states.

Zero Option Is 'Dead'

[Zorin] Well, and at the conclusion of our talk, I would like to say the following: A very serious year has begun. Much in the world depends on how affairs in the international arena work out in 1983.

Now, if we were to do it as briefly as possible, how could we determine our foreign policy tasks in 1983?

[Chervov] Let us look at this from the point of view of solving disarmament problems. Of course 1983 is the most responsible period at the disarmament talks. And it is primarily up to the West to decide whether or not it wants to negotiate. On the missile issue that is most important for the West, the Soviet Union has proposed the lowest possible level corresponding to the principle of equality and identical security. I would like to recall the words of Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: We appeal to our partners to accept this clear and just arrangement and to take advantage of this opportunity while it still exists.

I think that the main thing that should be overcome in order to be successful at the talks in Geneva and Vienna is the U.S. and NATO line on changing the correlation of forces for military superiority. Equality and identical security -- this is the basis for solving the disarmament question.

[Shishlin] I think that Nikolay Fedorovich is absolutely right when he says that the key problem is the problem of limiting and curtailing the arms race. But -- as the television viewers know and all of us who in recent years have become used to attentively following the lunar calendar year know -- it is maintained that the year of the boar should be a year of wise and balanced decisions and a tranquil year. However, one involuntarily remembers here a Griboyedov character who kept saying that all calendars lie.

This is, of course, a year of many anxieties but it is also a year of hopes. It must be said that during the first month of this year the Soviet Union and other socialist countries did not waste any time. This was a month of enormous diplomatic and foreign policy work, which -- as we probably all feel -- has yielded certain results.

Eleven months are ahead of us. Of course, this is not a short period of time, but neither is it long. I think that after all it could be put as follows: Despite the fact that we have already discussed the new round of Soviet-U.S. talks, nevertheless the new round begins with the fact that Reagan's zero option is dead, and Washington is powerless to revive it. It is dead.

[Chervov] This is already recognized in both the United States and in the West.

[Shishlin] Yes, and of course, much will depend not only on the U.S. position but also on the position of the Europeans, the West Europeans in particular, who have far from the last word, not only in the fortunes of our continent but also in the fortunes of the world as such. And I would like to hope that will be a mature and balanced word.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, as well as our friends, allies and partners, it is perfectly obvious that the line outlined at the Prague conference is absolutely clear. This is a line for strengthening peace and protecting the interests of our country and our allies from possible threats, and a line for radically normalizing the political climate in the world.

[Zorin] Well, then, our time on the air has expired. It remains for me to thank you for participating in our talk and to thank our television viewers. Until our next meeting on the air here in our "Studio 9," thank you.

PURPOSE OF BUSH VISIT TO WESTERN EUROPE ASSESSED

Propaganda Campaign

LD281532 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT 28 Jan 83

["Apropos George Bush's Visit to Europe" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 28 TASS -- Washington has of late become increasingly vocal in drawing public attention to a "peaceful nature" of U.S. diplomacy and the United States' "peace-making role" in Europe. But Washington's actual deeds indicate that the United States continues to stick to its old policy, the newspaper IZVESTIYA writes today in connection with U.S. Vice-President George Bush's trip to Western Europe. They in Washington are not at all going to renounce their striving to wreck the existing nuclear parity and to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union at all cost, the commentary says. The advocates of a "tough line" are demanding a sizable increase in the Pentagon's budget for fiscal 1984. Appropriations for strategic nuclear weapons of mass annihilation alone will be boosted to reach 30 billion dollars, an increase of eight billion dollars over the current fiscal year.

George Bush's trip, the newspaper says, is being undertaken in the framework of a propaganda campaign in support of the American approach to arms control and the upgrading of nuclear forces in Western Europe.

This has also been pointed out by the American press. Bush's trip, spokesmen for the White House told THE WASHINGTON POST, was designed to counter the groundswell anti-nuke movement in Western Europe. The goal, of course, is, first of all, to try to influence public opinion in Western Europe, which has met with great interest the peace initiatives put forward by the socialist countries, IZVESTIYA wrties. The proposals contained in the speech of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yuriy Andropov and the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member-states have won broadly-based recognition among the Western Europeans.

The growth of anti-war, anti-American sentiments is assessed on the banks of the Potomac as something that cannot be tolerated and that is extremely dangerous to U.S. militarist plans -- dangerous because the ruling circles of the countries, which are Washington's partners in NATO, cannot but reckon with these sentiments.

U.S. Position at Geneva

LD290608 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 28 Jan 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Valentin Gubernatorov and Yevgeniy Kachanov]

[Text] U.S. Vice President George Bush is setting out on Sunday for a trip that will take him to seven European countries. He will visit the FRG, Italy, France, Great Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands and Switzerland. Speaking at a press conference in Washington, Bush devoted most of his attention to the issues related to the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. Observers are comming to the conclusion that the main purpose of Bush's trip will be an attempt to convince the West Europeans that the American Administration has adequate flexibility to conduct negotiations with the Soviet Union. But at the same time Bush confirmed that he would not be bringing any new proposals to Europe. That means that the American delegation in Geneva will continue to stick to the so-called zero option during the negotiations. As is well known, this variant envisages the elimination of all Soviet medium-range missiles on the territory of the USSR.

At the same time, similar weapons of NATO countries will remain in place in Western Europe. In point of fact, the United States is demanding of the Soviet Union unilateral disarmament, to which we shall obviously not agree under any conditions. Therefore, as can be easily surmised, it is precisely the American attitude that constitutes the fundamental cause for the slow progress at the Geneva negotiations.

Antinuclear Movement

LD290449 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] Vice President George Bush appears to be making more than the usual preparations for his trip to Western Europe. In our commentary Andrey Shepilov considers why. This is what he writes:

Mr Bush is preparing for his visit at a time when the American news media are talking about (?disarray) and chaos in the administration on the issue of disarmament. Yet what the West European governments expect of the vice president is a reply to the latest peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the more so since the deadline is approaching for deployment of the new American Pershings and cruise missiles, and there is no sign of progress at the Geneva talks on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

Most people in Western Europe are horrified at the prospects of having their country turned into a launching pad for American missiles. This explains the interest in the proposal made by the Warsaw Treaty countries for a treaty with the NATO countries on mutual nonuse of force and in the latest Soviet proposal concerning medium-rang nuclear weapons. Moscow is prepared to reduce these weapons by more than two-thirds and retain only as many as Britain and France have together, provided, of course, the United States refrains from placing new missiles in Europe. This proposal is the Soviet Union's third move to modify its position at the Geneva talks so as to bring about a mutually acceptable agreement.

Now on the eve of George Bush's visit, Western Europe is looking to Washington to do something. Up to now Washington has insisted on the zero option, which is unacceptable for the Soviet Union. The media talk about (?disarray) in the administration has prompted President Reagan to speak several times of being dedicated to peace and disarmament. But words are not enough in international politics, and especially on such an issue as disarmament. And the actions of the United States up to now point to quite a different dedication. It has come to light, for one, that President Reagan wrote to Congressman Jack Kemp threatening to call off the Geneva talks unless the administration gets the MX missile. This fact can scarcely bolster Mr Reagan's claim that his administration is serious about the talks.

All this arouses serious doubts whether Vice President Bush can say anything new in Europe. There is probably more truth in what THE WASHINGTON POST has said, quoting White House officials, about the purpose of the trip, namely, that it's intended to upset the growing movements in Western Europe against nuclear weapons and influence public opinion there. So we have President Reagan insisting on new missiles first and disarmament talks later, and Vice President Bush going to Europe not to find ways of combating the nuclear threat, but to upset the growing movement for peace. Such an approach to disarmament takes nonsense of the White House claim to be seeking peace. Indeed, it confirms what one American news analyst has said that since poker is a national game in the United States, there is sure to be an element of bluff in the United States' foreign policy.

'Nothing New' To Offer

LD301520 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] Washington January 30 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev reporting: U.S. Vice-President George Bush today leaves the United States on a tour of Western Europe which will take him to West Germany, Holland, Belgium, Italy, France and Britain where he is to hold talks with their leaders. His schedule also includes meetings at the NATO Headquarters in Brussels and with heads of U.S. negotiating teams at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

Officially the vice-president's task is to hold candid consultations with the allies on political and security issues, specifically, on the problems pertaining to the talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe. However, the real aims of his tour -- ordered personally by U.S. President Reagan -- are different. They are to try and convince West European public of the "peaceful stance" of the United States and at the same time to bring pressure to bear on the leaders of those countries in order to make them reaffirm their consent to the realisation of the dangerous plans for the deployment of new U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe.

In doing so Vice-President Bush is to rely heavily on the attempts to neutralise the attractive force of the new peace initiatives advanced by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries -- the initiatives positively evaluated by the wide circles of West European public.

According to THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, the very fact that the tour has been ordered reflects the extreme nervouseness of the Reagan administration, its alarm over the unprecedented scope of the European movement in protest against NATO's sinister plans.

At the same time both Western European public and even some politicians in Western Europe openly question the sincerity of Washington's assurances to the effect that the Reagan administration is interested at all in an early agreement at the Geneva talks. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, suspicions are wide-spread that the United States only pretends to negotiate, while trying to gain time for intensifying its military buildup.

At a meeting with journalists on the eve of his tour Vice-President Bush admitted that he had nothing new to take along on his tour, and that during his consultations with the allies he would simply reiterate the U.S. position which is known to boil down to the attempts to upset the existing approximate parity of forces in Europe and to press for the Soviet Union's virtual disarmament.

Apart from political issues George Bush is also to discuss problems of economic relations between the United States and its allies. According to Bush himself, those problems are numerous and complex. West Europeans are known to voice open dissatisfaction with the self-serving policies of the Reagan administration in foreign trade and finance -- a policy which seriously damages the interests of European countries and exacerbates difficulties in their economies.

FINANCIAL TIMES Cited

LD301044 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1245 GMT 29 Jan 83

[From the "International Review" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] In order to reassure its allies and to reattune their positions to the common denominator of American policy, the vice president of the United States begins a tour of Europe tomorrow.

In the opinion of the London newspaper THE FINANCIAL TIMES, apart from anything else Bush will try to neutralize the impression made on Western Europe by the visit of Andrey Andreyerich Gromyko to the FRG. The U.S. vice president will obviously seek to prove that the White House regards the problem of disarmament seriously. He has even stated that he intends to meet personally with the Soviet representatives at the Geneva talks.

The question, however, is what Bush plans to propose in concrete terms. So far, according to statements by Washington, it concerns the same zero option, although maybe in a slightly renewed form, that is to say, a continuation of the same U.S. line aimed at achieving unilateral military supremacy. These political maneuvers give rise to a skeptical attitude even among Western observers. The same FINANCIAL TIMES points out in its comment that Bush's visit will be a mistake, perhaps even a serious mistake, on the part of the American Administration. It reminds Washington that the audience of chief significance now is not Mrs Thatcher in Britain or Chancellor Kohl in Germany, both of whom remain adherents of NATO, but the European public. Although the opinion of this audience continues to be disregarded, it has not yet had its last word. A little more than a month remains until the general parliamentary election in the FRG. The question of the deployment of the new American nuclear weapons on West German soil is already one of the chief issues of the election campaign.

Arrival in Bonn Reported

LD302227 Moscow TASS in English 2210 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 31 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy reports:

U.S. Vice President George Bush has arrived on an official visit in Bonn, the first stopover on his tour of a number of West European NATO countries. It has been announced officially that he will hold talks with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher on questions connected with the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe.

Political observers point out that the White House's envoy will try to convince his hosts that the American Administration is holding a flexible position on the talks and is prepared to contribute to their success. Washington has obviously been forced to try to create such an impression by ciriticism voiced by numerous West European politicians, who justly believe that the U.S. "zero option" is unacceptable and merely blocks the Geneva talks.

Talks With Kohl, Genscher

LD311356 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 31 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 31 TASS -- U.S. Vice-President George Bush, who arrived here within the framework of the tour of a number of West European countries, has held talks today with FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. As was officially announced, the talks covered, among other things, questions connected with the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe.

In his public statements in Washington and Bonn George Bush was trying to create an impression of U.S. Administration's "flexibility" on those talks. But the White House is known to stubbornly adhere to the so-called "zero option" and to have given relevent instructions to the head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks. The attempt to mislead the public has been caused by the growing criticism of Washington's stand in Western Europe, including from prominent political figures, who believe with good reason that the "zero option" is unacceptable and only blocks the Geneva talks.

Repeated demands are loudly voiced in the FRG as well as in other NATO member countries that the Reagan administration should display, at last, not by word of mouth but in action readiness for the attainment to positive results at the Geneva talks, to respond to the constructive proposals of the USSR and other countries of the socialist community.

In its commentaries on the visit of the U.S. vice-president the West German press draws attention above all to its apparently propagandist character. "It is not fortuitous that George Bush's European tour has been timed to the propaganda campaign launched by Ronald Reagan and designed for the allies to publicise Washington's arms control policy, above all the deployment of 'Pershing-2' and cruise missiles in the old world."

The Bonn newspaper GENERAL-ANZEIGER points out in its turn that these days Washington has to advocate a policy which increasingly meets with distrust even from its friends.

'Difficult Mission' Ahead

LD311414 Mosocw Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 31 Jan 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Viktor Anikin and Petr Fedorov]

[Text] U.S. Vice President Bush, who is visiting seven West European countries, is having talks in Bonn today with Kohl, head of the West German coalition government, and with Foreign Minister Genscher. During his West European tour, Bush will try to influence the development of a unified policy by the Western powers in matters connected with the Geneva negotiations on nuclear arms limitations. Bush would like to convince the Europeans that the U.S. side has a supposedly flexible position toward these important talks and is endeavoring to promote their success. Washington is clearly troubled by criticism from many West European political figures who rightly feel that Reagan's notorious zero option does nothing but block the talks in Geneva.

As a REUTER correspondent notes, the transatlantic emissary has a difficult mission ahead of him in West Germany because, on the eve of a general Bundestagelection on 6 March, the present coalition government in Bonn has to take account of the mood of West German voters who are alarmed by the growing danger of war in Europe in connection with the deployment of new American medium-range missiles. In these conditions more and more popularity is being won by the opposition Social Democratic Party which, unlike the ruling CDU-Free Democrat ruling bloc, regards the deployment of U.S. cruise and Pershing-II missiles in West Germany as undesirable.

So Kohl has found himself, if we may put it this way, between Scylla and Charybdis. On the one hand pressure is being exerted on him from Washington, which wants to obtain support for its zero option, and on the other hand Kohl fears losing the trust of West German citizens on the eve of a general election to the Bundestag.

WASHINGTON POST Cited

LD311551 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 31 Jan 83

[Text] Washington January 31 TASS -- Great attention is attached to George Bush's trip in the Washington corridors of power. As is noted by the newspaper WASHINGTON POST, the main aim of the trip is to try to convince the population of West European countries that the Reagan administration seriously approaches the problem of control over armaments. Another, less advertised task, set to George Bush is to exert once again pressure upon leaders of West European states and to get confirmation of their consent to realisation of the Pentagon's ominous plans to deploy new American nuclear-missile weapons in Western Europe.

The newspaper writes that George Bush started his trip from a visit to the FRG because particularly complicated and critical situation developed for the United States in that country where elections to the Bundestag are scheduled to be held on March 6.

'DISHONESTY' OF REAGAN'S PROPOSED BUDGET VIEWED

LD311017 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2330 GMT 30 Jan 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Valentin Gubernatorov]

[Text] U.S. President Reagan today will present a new draft budget for the country for the new fiscal year beginning 1 October for examination by Congress. Although the draft has not yet been published officially, the main points in it have already become known and have given rise to considerable alarm among both representatives of the Democratic and of the ruling Republican Party. Suffice it to say that the 1984 budget envisages an increase in the expenditures of $43 billion and 3/4 of this sum is being allocated to the needs of the Pentagon.

An AP correspondent puts it bluntly: The draft budget proposed by Reagan envisages cuts in many social and economic programs in order to ensure an increase of $30 billion for military purposes. The President himself calls the new budget honest and realistic, though Senator Edward Kennedy states that the intentions of the present Washington administration to reduce appropriations for social needs are a new example of insensitivity and dishonesty toward workers and the aged.

SOLTAN ON U.S. 'CAMPAIGN OF SLANDER,' BUDGET

LD291756 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 29 Jan 83

[Commentary by Yuriy Soltan]

[Excerpts] Washington has once again launched a campaign of slander over the mythical Soviet military threat. Now comments on that by Yuriy Soltan:

Many consider 1983 a critical year. The world has arrived at a fork in the road. One way leads to the relaxation of international tensions and stronger world cooperation and the other leads to a continuation of the arms race and a greater military threat, primarily a nuclear threat. The Soviet Union believes that the current dangerous stage in international relations can be overcome. This is the aim of the recent Soviet initiatives proposed by the countries in the Warsaw Treaty.

But Washington shows no desire to listen to reason. There the efforts are geared to use any kind of falsification to stop the wave of antiwar protests, distort the Soviet initiatives and justify an unrestrained arms race and this is why the propaganda campaign about the mythical Soviet military threat is being revived. The President of the United States is the instigator of the campaign. He has ordered the creation of a special propaganda committee headed by National Security Adviser William Clark to condition public opinion. As an experiment in so-called public diplomacy, Vice President George Bush was sent to Western Europe. The purpose of the trip, as explained by THE NEW YORK TIMES, is to give a propaganda rebuff to Soviet proposals on reducing nuclear weapons in Europe.

Symptomatically, the new outbreak of anti-Soviet hysteria coincides with introduction in Congress of the new budget. The White House is demanding nearly $280 billion for military preparations in the next fiscal year. One of America's greatest statesmen, Abraham Lincoln, once said that you can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time. It wouldn't be a bad idea if the current leadership in the White House would remember that quotation.

MOSCOW VIEWS 'GROWING DANGER' OF B-52 MISHAPS

LD291255 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 29 Jan 83

[Text] At the U.S. Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota an emergency occurred when a fire broke out aboard a B-52 strategic bomber which was standing on the runway. ASSOCIATED PRESS reported that it took 3 hours to fight the blaze and that 5 people died and 12 were injured. The command at the Grand Forks Base hastened to tell the press that there were no nuclear weapons aboard the strategic bomber. But it was forced to admit that had there been such weapons aboard then a disaster of unforeseeable proportions would have ensued.

The militarist fever which has seized the White House and the unprecedented arms race in the United States are leading increasingly often to such emergencies. Two strategic bombers malfunctioned and crashed a month ago in California. Just as it did today, the U.S. Air Force command on that occasion tried to calm public opinion by giving assurances that the aircraft were on training flights and were not carrying nuclear bombs.

It is striking that on that occasion, too, the aircraft concerned was the B-52 which American strategists have designed to be one of today's decisive components in the U.S. so-called nuclear triad. This bomber is intended in particular to carry cruise missiles. At the beginning of this year the Pentagon began to keep a squadron of aircraft of this type in a state of full combat readiness on round-the-clock standby at the U.S. Griffiss Air Force Base in New York State. Under each wing of these flying fortresses are 12 cruise missiles fitted with nuclear warheads. What if one of the bombers in this squadron crashes?

Washington's war games are fraught with mortal danger for the population of those parts of the United States and Europe where the U.S. military build or deploy their nuclear missiles or where aircraft bearing the identification marks of the U.S. Air Force roam the skies. This danger is growing. Evidence of this is to be found in U.S. President Reagan's recent traditional annual State of the Union message, which says among other things that U.S. strategy must be based on strength -- economic strength and military strength.

REPORT ON USSR ECONOMY 'BLOW' TO U.S. LEADERS

LD290515 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Talk by Vladimir Pozner]

[Text] The first days of 1983 provided a rude blow to the Reaganite policymakers, for the approach towards the Soviet Union had been the following: no (?military) giant, they said; the USSR is an economic weakling, therefore it can be forced to its knees by a combination of two things: Western economic pressure and an arms buildup. Forced into such competition the Soviets will find themselves on the brink of economic disaster. That was the advice given to President Reagan and, by and large, that advice has been followed.

However, the publication of a CIA analysis of the Soviet economy from 1950 to 1980 left those gentlemen in a state of what referees in the ring call TKO. Even though the CIA estimates are far below those that figure in Soviet statistical publications and even though they are lower than those provided by leading American scholars they show -- and I wish to quote Henry Reuss, the recently retired chairman of the congressional committee which requested the study -- the CIA estimates show that the Soviet Union, far from being on the verge of collapse, has experienced major growth. Thus, over the past 30 years the CIA report has Soviet industrial production increasing seven times, farm output doubling, the GNP quadrupling, per capita consumption tripling.

The conclusion, while not (?expressive), is obvious between the lines. It is: In the face of an unrestrained arms race the Soviet Union has the economic capacity, consumer (?leeway) and political ability to compete with an American buildup.

Last Sunday the Soviet Union's central statistical bureau published the economic results for 1982. By and large they more than confirm the above mentioned. Without going into details, let me simply say that everything was up: industrial production, agriculture, living standards. More was produced, more was on sale, more was bought, and more was earned. This does not exclude problems. Labor productivity was growing but at a slower rate than expected. In some areas of industry and agriculture the planned-for figures were not obtained. Transportation created serious stumble-blocks [as heard]. But all this notwithstanding, there could be no doubt as to the overall picture.

Quite frankly I find nothing surprising in the state of our economic affairs which, though not what we would consider fully satisfactory, is far from anything remotely resembling a recession. But what does surprise me is this curious inability to learn. The first 5-year economic plan was announced back in 1928 and went into action in '29. It was greeted in the West with everything from derision to the most pessimistic prediction. The First 5-Year Plan grew into the second and again the same reaction. The war interrupted the third, but after the war, when we had to rebuild the devastated economy, the Western prediction was that it would take us 50 years. We reached our pre-war level in less than 10.

You'd think such things would change people's attitudes and make them think. And it did, but not in all cases which is why it became possible for President Reagan to have advisers tell him to put the USSR under the economic pressure of an arms race. And what's happened? America is in one of the worst recessions since the Depression while our economic situation was better in '82 than in '81 and we have every reason to believe that '83 will be better than was '82.

MOSCOW NOTES SUCCESSFUL TEST OF PERSHING MISSILE

LD281404 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 28 Jan 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Aleksandr Levchenko and Vladimir Gerasichev]

[Text] According to ASSOCIATED PRESS reporting from Washington, the U.S. Defense Department has announced that the designers of the new Pershing II missile which carries nuclear warheads have achieved their goal during tests of the missile at Cape Canaveral, Florida.

As the agency reports, the missile's range is around 1,300 km. According to NATO plans, missiles of this type in full combat readiness are to be stationed in West Europe: 108 Pershing II missiles are due to be deployed in West Germany to supplement almost 500 cruise missiles which are to be installed in five West European countries. NATO generals plan to begin stationing these missiles in December this year.

The Pentagon announcement again confirms the fact that the U.S. military and the U.S. Administration brazenly ignore demands of the international public not to go ahead with stationing the new deadly weapon on the territory of West Europe, which would pose a threat to peace not only on the European Continent but also worldwide.

MOOD OF AMERICANS, STATEMENTS BY MONDALE VIEWED

LD301112 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1245 GMT 29 Jan 83

[From the "International Review" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpt] There is still a lot of time before the U.S. presidential elections take place in the autumn of 1984, but in essence the election campaign has already begun. One of its first volleys was a speech by Walter Mondale, former vice president of the United States. It is expected that in February he will officially announce his decision to run for the Democratic Party's nomination for election to the post of President. But he is already stating what he would do if he became President. In that case, Mondale said, he would cut the Pentagon budget, put forward the SALT II treaty for Senate ratification, take serious measures toward the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and try to meet with the Soviet leaders.

When Mondale was included in the administration of President Carter, however, he spoke in a different spirit. His current statements are aimed at enlisting the support of the American electorate and constitute indirect evidence of the mood of the Americans. An increasing number are expressing disagreement with the dangerous militaristic course of Reagan and with the astronomic growth in military spending to the detriment of social programs.

REAGAN EXPOSED BY 'SLIP' ON COMPANY TAXES

LD291445 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2241 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow 29 Jan (TASS) -- Speaking in Boston before representatives of companies mainly engaged in the military electronics industry, U.S. President R. Reagan said that he is inclined toward the idea of abolishing taxes on company incomes. The President's words aroused a lot of noise in political circles and the press. Not a day goes by without the White House, through the mouth of the assistant press secretary, disavowing the President's words. It was recommended that this be regarded as yet another "slip of the tongue" by the head of state.

Gennadiy Vasilyev writes about this in PRAVDA. He stresses that this "slip of the tongue" has graphically exposed the class nature of the policy of this government. Implementation of the President's idea would toss to the companies a fat sum in the region of $600 billion. And the U.S. Treasury would be deprived of the same amount, which would have to be compensated for either by increasing the extortion from the population or by even crueller cuts in social programs.

"Thus, this would be a new step in the direction along which the administration has already been moving for the past 2 years," the commentary says. "In this period the monopolies have received many tax privileges, the arms manufacturers are reaping a rich harvest of military orders and millions of jobless, poor people and simply working Americans are paying for all this with ever more severe deprivations."

The President's "slip of the tongue" has brought the attention of Americans to the essence of the entire economic policy of the government -- a policy of attacking the vital interests of the working people, of indulgences for the monopolies and of a dangerous arms race which is exhausting the country," the commentator sums up.

SHULTZ, FAR-EAST TOUR AIMED AT 'MILITARIZATION'

LD301126 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] Washington January 30 TASS -- TASS correspondent V. Legantsov reports:

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has started on a 12-day tour of the Asian countries, which will take him to Japan, China and South Korea. He is also to meet in Hong Kong with American ambassadors to Asian countries.

At the first stage of his tour the U.S. secretary of state, as the AP agency said, will devote his main attention to pressure on Japan, seeking from that country a further increase in military spendings and in its military presence in the Pacific. Representatives of the Washington administration do not conceal the fact that Washington's main aim is to place under its control the military policy of the Japanese Government, to create in the Far East a powerful American-Japanese military force. Japan, as John Holdridge, former U.S. assistant secretary of state, recently said, is the key factor of the U.S. strategy in East Asia. The Reagan administration intends to place on the Japanese Navy and Air Force, the main responsibility for combat operations within a radius of 1,000 nautical miles from the Japanese islands and also make its ally considerably increase spendings on the maintenance of the 50 thousand-strong contingent of the American troops and military facilities in Japan. Washington also insists that the government of Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone bear the bulk of the spendings in connection with the deployment in Misawa Airbase of additional 48 American "F-16" fighter bombers.

Shultz will also carry on in Tokyo the policy of "arm twisting", which was started by President Reagan at the recent meeting with Prime Minister Nakasone, with the aim of compelling Japan to forgo its economic interests and open the door wide into Japan's home market for uncontrolled activities of American industrial, trade and financial corporations.

As observers point out, in Beijing Shultz will have to convince the Chinese leadership that the USA strives to develop relations with the PRC, and, at the same time, justify the policy of the Reagan administration of a steady build up of Taiwan's military potential. The American press expresses the opinion that the debate on problems of bilateral American-Chinese trade relations will be a heated one in connection with the tough protectionist measures taken by Washington against Chinese textile imports and the retaliatory actions of Beijing, which refused to purchase a number of American products.

In the course of his stay in Seoul, Shultz, as the American press say, will assure the South Korean dictatorial regime of the invariability of U.S. military commitments and the administration's intention to carry on all-round assistance to Seoul. South Korea has already long been assigned in Washington's militaristic plans the role of a key American military outpost for implementing aggressive designs in Asia. South Korea is viewed in the USA as an important link of the military bloc USA-Japan-South Korea which was created by Washington and is practically already functioning. More than 40,000 American troops equipped with the latest weapons, including tactical missiles, are already stationed there. Washington is also rearming the 400 thousand-strong Seoul puppet Army.

It is not fortuitous that Washington has recently devoted special attention to the Far Eastern countries. Contrary to the assurances made by the Reagan administration of its alleged striving for strengthening peace in Asia, the whole of its policy boils down to an encouragement of militarization of the countries in that region and building up tensions.

STRAUSS' POSITION ON U.S. MISSILES, GENEVA VIEWED

LD291448 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2253 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow 29 Jan (TASS) -- Diplomatic finesse was never one of Franz-Josef Strauss's strong points," Vladimir Mikhaylov writes in PRAVDA. "He was always adept at making gaffes -- leaving others to clear up after him."

The writer comments on the claim by F.-J. Strauss, leader of the West German rightists in the conservative CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union], that it is impossible for the Geneva talks to produce an agreement which would avert the deployment of Pershing-II and cruise missiles in West Europe. The USSR, Strauss reasoned aloud, would not agree to Reagan's "Zero" option: It is "senseless", "unattainable", and the Soviet proposals do not suit the United States.

"In this situation the Munich stratetist decided: What if we place the Soviet and American proposals side-by-side and declare them 'unacceptable' together?

"Strauss is still guided by this false logic in his later arguments," V. Mikhaylov continues. "He declared that the deployment of Pershing-II and cruise missiles is an unconditional necessity' and if the West European states do not dare give their consent to it, then 'irreparable damage' will be done to NATO. And so get those missiles here at all costs!"

The writer points out that the frank admission by a CDU/CSU leader that he would like to give up the possibility of agreement as a bad job and is ready to let the American missiles in at once, has caused a flurry among the "Christians". "After this, how can they convince the electors that the CDU/CSU gives preference not to 'counterarming' but to talks aimed at avoiding that? Extreme measures must be resorted to. A joint statement by the federal secretaries of the CDU and the CSU was published, 'modifying' the revelations of the Munich 'missile-bearer'."

VOGEL'S WASHINGTON, MOSCOW TRIPS COMPARED

LD281053 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jan 83 p 9

[Article by Vladimir Lomeyko: "Two Hours and Twenty Minutes"]

[Text] Allied commitments frequently overstep the bounds of good sense. This thought was expressed by Western journalists accompanying Hans-Jochen Vogel, Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] candidate for the FRG chancellorship, comparing his recent trips to Washington and Moscow. They were talking about NATO commitments and good sense in the face of the growing nuclear threat.

In some cases it is worth calling a spade a spade to avoid making the wrong choice in terms of what is most important -- saving Europeans from a nuclear Auschwitz. The President of the "defender"-power had this fate in store for his allies when he put forward the doctrine of "limited nuclear war." But Moscow has put forward the realistic alternative of lowering the level of nuclear confrontation. And it is encountering a widespread response in Europe and all over the world.

H.-J. Vogel and his aides went to the United States on a difficult mission: While stressing their loyalty to the United States and NATO, they wanted at the same time to explain to the U.S. President the concern of West Germans and their desire that there be fewer and on no account more missiles in Europe.

And what was the outcome? The White House boss found 20 minutes for all that. Just 20 minutes in the face of such problems and such disparate approaches to their solution.

And the President allocated even those 20 minutes not because he particularly wanted to, but because he had a reason: that on 6 March Vogel may suddenly become FRG chancellor!

Thus the President held a reception where, having heard out the SPD's candidate for the chancellorship for whom millions of citizens are voting, he merely confined himself to the remark that the United States "is making serious efforts at the Geneva talks" (what sort of efforts, one may ask, are those which are blocking any agreements?).

Answering in Washington the question of how he assesses the seriousness of the U.S. side's approach to the Geneva talks, Dr Vogel diplomatically stated that his viewpoint on this score "had not been reinforced, neither had it been weakened." A case of as you were, as they say.

Now let us look at Vogel's visit to Moscow through the eyes of those accompanying him. West German journalists noted the Soviet leaders' profound interest in the talks with the SPD delegation.

The very fact that Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, talked with H.-J. Vogel for over 2 hours is very indicative! I was told this several times by Western colleagues at the press center. As for the assence and spirit of the talk, the candidate for the FRG chancellorship said that it had been fruitful and frank. "I was speaking to a man who is fully aware of his reponsibility for avoiding military catastrophe and for the fate not only of his own people but of all mankind," Vogel said. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's comments on the problem of medium-range missiles are constructive in character, he added, expressing the hope that the U.S. side will not insist on its preliminary position at the Geneva talks.

As for hope, that is still a big issue. It has yet to be seen that Washington wants to agree on anything. On the contrary, everything is being done to accelerate the deployment of missiles in Europe. THE WASHINGTON POST writes: "In the European capitals politicians are in a sweat at the thought of new missiles being deployed in the absence of any progress at the Geneva talks."

Let us add here that if even Paul Nitze, head of the U.S. delegation, has stated that he will not go to Geneva without new and more flexible instructions, that means that even he is sick to death of it, that you will not get far with the President's "zero" option, and that a convincing answer is needed to the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union.

Speaking on FRG television prior to his visit to Moscow, Vogel stated that he would ask the voters for a mandate for the kind of policy that would help to remove the need to deploy new missiles. On the strength of those words, I asked him at the press conference whether that could be understood in the sense that he himself and the SPD in the current situation are opposed in principle to the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in the FRG.

In reply, Vogel stated that the SPD supports the success of the talks and the removal of the need to deploy the U.S. missiles but that it would take a final decision at its extraordinary congress at the end of 1983...

Must one wait? Until late 1983? Meanwhile, the preparations to deploy the U.S. missiles are in full swing in Western Europe.

FRG VIOLATION OF BERLIN AGREEMENT CLAIMED

LD281753 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] West Berlin January 28 TASS -- The newspaper WAHRHEIT qualifies as a violation of the four-sided agreement on West Berlin the fact that the "Green Week" international agricultural exhibition, which opened here on Thursday, is being held "under the patronage of the Federal President of the FRG Karl Carstens". In addition to this, the exhibition was officially opened by the Minister of Food, Agriculture and Forestry of the FRG Josef Ertl.

The paper recalls in this connection the crucial provision of the four-sided agreement: West Berlin is not a part of the FRG and will not be administered by it in future as well. The formal activities of FRG officials in West Berlin directly contradict the letter and spirit of this important international document which is of such great importance for the consolidation of detente and cooperation in Europe. Violations of the agreement contradict the vital interests of the city and its citizens.

The paper stresses that despite numerous protests by the public, the organisers of the exhibition allowed the racist Republic of South Africa to participate. As is known, independent Africa demands an end to all economic and trade ties with the regime of apartheid.

NUCLEAR DETERRENCE HAS MAIN ROLE IN FRENCH POLICY

LD282025 Moscow TASS in English 1949 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] Paris January 28 TASS -- Nine new strategic "C-3" [as received] missiles became operational today at the French missile base situated on the Albion Plateau, south-eastern France. They replaced the obsolete "C-2" missile systems. Thus, the French land-based strategic force now includes 18 "C-3" missiles whose range is 3,500 kilometres. The aggregate power of their warheads is about 85 megatons, an equivalent of 5,660 atom bombs of the type that was dropped by the U.S. on Hiroshima.

Speaking at a ceremony held at the base, the French Minister of National Defence Charles Hernu said that the French Government will continue to view nuclear deterrence as the principal instrument of the country's military policy. He also confirmed that the French command is already in the process of studying the design of a new missile system to replace the "C-3" missiles in existence now.

At present the French strategic force includes, in addition to the missiles, 36 aircraft carrying nuclear weapons as well as 5 nuclear-missile submarines.

SHALAYEV-LED AUCCTU DELEGATION ARRIVES IN PARIS

LD301543 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1437 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] Paris, 30 Jan (TASS) -- At the invitation of the General Labor Confederation (CGT), a delegation of Soviet trade unions led by Stepan Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, arrived here today.

At the Charles de Gaulle Airport, the AUCCTU delegation was met by Henri Krasucki, general secretary of the CGT, and members of the CGT Executive Committee.

During the coming meetings between the AUCCTU delegation and the CGT there will be an exchange of information on the activity of the trade union centers of their respective countries. Talks will be held on questions of bilateral cooperation and problems concerning the international trade union movement will also be discussed.

COMMUNIQUE ON FRENCH-SOVIET SYMPOSIUM RELEASED

LD310045 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1947 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] Paris, 30 Jan (TASS) -- A symposium on the theme "French-Soviet Cooperation: The Reality and Opportunities Today and Tomorrow" has ended its work here. It was organized by the "France-USSR" and "USSR-France" societies. Over a 3-day period those taking part in it -- state and public figures from the two countries, scientists, representatives of business circles and cultural figures -- exchanged opinions on various aspects of bilateral cooperation.

Fruitful dialogues, the final communique on the symposium says, has shown that is is possible not only to expand cooperation in all areas where it is already in existence but also to open up new areas. In accordance with their mission to improve further mutual acquaintance, cooperation and friendship between the French and Soviet peoples and in the interests of both countires, the "France-USSR" and "USSR-France" societies will continue to make their contribution to expanding cooperation between the two countries in the interests of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED NATO BASES IN ITALY NOTED

LD290723 Moscow in Italian to Italy 1800 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Excerpts] According ot the Italian daily LA REPUBBLICA, there is a plan to build a new NATO military base on the island of Lampedusa. We have asked our observer Anatoliy Yuriyev to comment on this report:

[Announcer] Anatoliy, unless I'm wrong, the news of the intention to build new NATO military bases in Italy, in particular the one in Lampedusa, came to light during the pre-Christmas Milan-Comiso peace march. Isn't that so?

[Yuriyev] Yes! These plans were denounced by the participants in the march. We knew that the government would announce this sort of news only at the very last moment, when it was no longer secret. So it was in the case of the construction of the base for American atomic submarines on Maddalena Island, off Sardinia.

With the usual delay, the news was announced on the assignment of the land near Comiso for the installation of American medium-range nuclear missiles. This is done in order to confront the population with an accomplished fact, and thus dampen the passion and agitation against the militarization of the country.

[Announcer] Nevertheless, these tricks often go off half-cocked. The movement against the construction of the Comiso base, to cite an example, is proof of this.

[Yuriyev] Yes! Considering the danger involved in the step, both for Italy and for European and world peace, the Italians have launched an initiative which has no precedent in the past, which is the peace march against the transformation of the country into a nuclear hostage for Washington, and in favor of nuclear missile disarmament.

In Sicily alone, the petition in support of the demand to suspend the construction of the base at Comiso, within a very few months, was signed by over a million people. The feeling of alarm and, of course, the protests, are increasing as the date for the installation of the cruise missiles gets nearer, something which as we know NATO intends to do by the end of 1983.

[Announcer] According to what you have just quoted and from the positions adopted by the Italian press, it emerges that in Italy increasingly sharp criticism is being aimed at the government because of its decision on the Comiso base question.

[Yuriyev] Yes! The government, because it is implicated by its blind obedience to Washington's directives which consider nuclear war possible -- both limited and prolonged; as though a war of this kind could be kept under control. The Italian Government is criticised for a zeal that could find a better application.

[Announcer] And how does Rome react to these criticisms?

[Yuriyev] For the moment, it persists in not taking into account the will of millions of peace supporters. It is sufficient to consider the proposal to make available the island of Lampedusa for another NATO base.

But the Italian peace supporters are not giving up. They confirm their unity, they are determined to safeguard peace and to take their country out of danger.

And this, in my view, is a guarantee that even the ruling classes will in the end have to take this reality into account.

CPSU DELEGATION BEGINS VISIT IN LEBANON 30 JAN

Moscow Departure

LD301630 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] A CPSU delegation led by Karen Brutents, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department, left the Soviet capital today for Beirut at the invitation of the Lebanese Communist Party Central Committee and the leadership of the Lebanese Progressive Socialist Party.

Arrival Statement in Beirut

NC301635 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1515 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] A CPSU delegation led by the deputy chairman of the International Department at the Central Committee, Brutents, arrived in Beirut this afternoon. The delegation leader said: We have come to acquaint ourselves with the situation in Lebanon and consequently to express our solidarity. We support the imposition of the legitimate authority on all parts of Lebanon.

Concerning Moscow's stand on the negotiations, Brutents said: We believe that if the negotiations lead to the Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon, then this will be linked with Israeli conditions jeopardizing the sovereignty of Lebanon and bringing Lebanon under Israeli domination for a long time.

Regarding Sharon's call for an Israeli-Soviet dialogue, the Soviet official said: It is our opinion that Israel must first withdraw from all the occupied territory.

Dialogue With Israel Rejected

LD310038 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 2110 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] Beirut, 30 Jan (SPA) -- The Soviet Union has rejected a proposal put forward by the Israelis for opening a dialgoue between the two sides in order to end the frozen relations between them before the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories.

The deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department, Brutents, said that the Zionist enemy must withdraw from all occupied Arab territories in order to talk about an Israeli-Soviet dialogue.

In a statement on arrival in Beirut this evening, the Soviet official added that his country's stand regarding the current negotiations between Lebanon and Israel is based on the fact that Israel will not withdraw from Lebanon until Israeli conditions that harm Lebanese soveriegnty are achieved. He stressed that these conditions will lead to the Zionist enemy's domination over Lebanon for a long period of time.

Concerning his visit to Lebanon, the Soviet official said that during the visit he aims to get acquainted with the conditions under which the Lebanese people have been living since the Israeli invasion. He expressed his country's solidarity with the Lebanese territories and the evacuation of the invading Zionist forces.

This visit is being made by Brutents at the head of a delegation from his country in response to an invitation from the Lebanese Progressive Socialist Party and the Communist Party.

DETAILS OF SOVIET ARMY DELEGATION VISIT TO SYRIA

NC291404 Paris AFP in English 1352 GMT 29 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow, Jan 29 (AFP) -- A Soviet Army delegation recently visited Syria and had talks with Syrian Defence Minister Gen Mustafa Talas, the Soviet Army newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reported today. The Soviet delegation also visited Syrian Army Headquarters and other military establishments, the paper said. It did not reveal the length of the visit.

Nor did it disclose details of Soviet military aid to Syria. The U.S. Government recently announced that Soviet SAM-5 surface-to-air missiles with a range of 240 to 300 kms (150 to 200 miles) were being deployed in Syria and that reinforcements of the Soviet military presence in Syria, already numbering 2,500 advisors, could be expected shortly. Reinforcements were confirmed on January 19 in the Soviet Government paper IZVESTIYA, which accused the United States of denying Syria her "inalienable right" to self-defence.

The Soviet Army daily went on to detail Soviet economic aid to Syria, which is said consisted of 64 joint projects, of which 35 were already underway.

SYRIAN BA'TH LEADER RECEIVES VISITING CPSU DELEGATION

PM281609 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Reception"]

[Text] Damascus, 20 Jan -- Today 'Abdallah al-Ahmar, assistant general secretary of the Ba'th Party, received a CPSU party workers' delegation led by T.K. Malbakhov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Kabardino-Balkar CPSU Obkom.

This visit, 'A. al-Ahmar emphasized during the discussion, is proceeding in conformity with the plan for ties between the Ba'th Party and the CPSU. The signing of the friendship and cooperation treaty between the USSR and Syria was a qualitatively new stage in the matter of broadening cooperation between Syria and the USSR and between the two parties.

The Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the Syrian party figure observed, was a new confirmation of the aggressiveness of American imperialism and Zionism, which are seeking to establish their domination over the Near East. However, all the schemes of imperialism, Zionism and reaction, he emphasized, are doomed to failure.

Syria's position in the matter of rebuffing the aggressive aspirations of hostile forces remains invariable. Syria, 'A. al-Ahmar stated, by relying on its own forces and strengthening cooperation with its friends, principally the Soviet Union, will continue to resist Zionist aggression and imperialist intrigues.

SOVIET FRIENDSHIP DELEGATION VISITS JORDAN

Meeting With Crown Prince

PM271117 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jan 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Delegation Received"]

[Text] Amman -- On 20 January Crown Prince Hasan of Jordan received a delegation of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, which is visiting Amman.

The Soviet guests also met with B. at-Talhuni, president of the Senate of the National Assembly, and S. 'Arar, president of Jordan's National Consultative Council. During the talks which took place the Jordanian statesmen highly appraised the Soviet Union's stand on the matter of achieving a just, comprehensive settlement in the Near East and noted the successful development of friendly relations between Jordan and the USSR.

Cooperation Plan Signed

PM281625 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Expanding Contacts"]

[Text] Amman, 24 Jan -- A plan for cooperation between the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, the "USSR-Jordan" Friendship Society and the Jordanian-Soviet Friendship Society for 1983-1984 was signed in Amman today. It envisages the exchanges of delegations of broad circles of the Soviet and Jordanian public, the organization of movie festivals and exhibitions and the holding of friendship days between the two countries' peoples.

Speaking at the signing of the plan, Rif'at 'Awdah, president of the Jordan-Soviet Friendship Society, stressed the benefit of broadening contacts between the Jordanian and Soviet peoples. He noted the Soviet Union's important role in the search for ways for a just solution to the Near East problem and in its support for the Palestinian Arab people's just struggle for their national rights.

MUBARAK U.S. VISIT, TALKS WITH REAGAN VIEWED

LD302236 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1730 GMT 30 Jan 83

[Text] After concluding their talks, both the U.S. and Egyptian presidents made statements to the press. They were both generous in their use of empty words about their striving for peace in the Middle East and in their emphasis on the friendship between the United States and Egypt. Reagan referred to the so-called special nature of the friendship between the United States and Egypt. The U.S. President expressed his satisfaction because his Egyptian partner in the talks appreciated the so-called Reagan plan for the settlement of the Middle East crisis. The Egyptian president expressed his approval of Washington's attempt to impose this peace on the Arabs in the Middle East -- a peace which is to guarantee, first and foremost, the colonialist interests of the United States in the region and to help Israel consolidate the fruit of its aggression. From President Reagan's statement it appears that Washington has great hope pinned on the mediation role of the Egyptian president to attract Jordan and some Palestinians who are not linked to the PLO to the Camp David process in the Middle East. The intention is to take out another group or two from the Arab front confronting the aggression and push them along the road of unilateral capitulationist policy.

Washington was generous in its promises to render military and economic assistance to Cairo, encouraging the Egyptian president to play such a role. It is appropriate here to recall the statement made by the representative of the U.S. department for [words indistinct] who declared to the Egyptian weekly AL-MUSAWWAR that the U.S. aid to Egypt is being given for political reasons first and foremost. Thus, the official spokesman of Washington is admitting that the United States, while giving funds to Egypt, is being guided not by assisting that country to solve its difficult and complicated social and economic problems but to encourage it to continue with the policy suitable for Washington.

In this connection, we would like to refer to a distinguishing (?characteristic) as far as Washington's policy is concerned. The Egyptian president called on Reagan to make efforts to achieve a total freeze on the building of Israeli settlements on occupied Arab territories. But the U.S. President, in actual fact, ignored this appeal and did not refer at all to this important issue in his statement to the press. Thus the U.S. President has encouraged Tel Aviv anew to continue with the policy of settling on occupied Palestinian and Syrian land. Therefore, the statement by the Egyptian president that the United States has shown that it is a real and faithful partner was very ambiguous indeed. Here, the following question comes to mind: To whom is the United States a real and faithful friend in the Middle East?

Fesunenko Commentary

LD290634 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 28 Jan 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] Washington: Talks have taken place in the White House between President Reagan of the USA and President Mubarak of Egypt. Also taking part in them were Vice President Bush, Secretary of State Shultz and the assistant to the President for national security affairs, Clark. Mubarak also met Defense Secretary Weinberger. At the talks the Near East situation and bilateral U.S.-Egyptian relations were discussed, including those in the strategic sphere. Speaking after the meeting, in front of journalists, Reagan endeavored to assert that the USA allegedly strives for peace in the Near East and the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon. Here the U.S. President of course passed over in silence the fact that it was precisely with the support of Washington that Israel perpetrated its barbaric aggression against that country, and now stubbornly refuses to withdraw its troops from its territory. In the course of this meeting, in the worlds of representatives of the U.S. Administration, Egyptian President Mubarak also pointed out that the highest priority should be given to achieving an agreement on the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon, and he severely criticized Tel Aviv's policy of setting up settlements in occupied Arab lands.

At the same time, as was pointed out in U.S. official circiles, Mubarak reaffirmed his adherence to the peace treaty with Israel, concluded within the framework of the separate Camp David deal. The U.S. press also points out the possibility of an expension of U.S. military aid to Egypt, which comes to $1.4 billion per year. Touching on cooperation in this sphere between the U.S. and Egypt, an official representative of the U.S. Administration noted with satisfaction that in exchange for this Egypt has agreed to grant the Pentagon the right to use military installations on its territory for the Rapid Deployment Force, including the Ra's Banas base, which Washington plans to modernize.

QATAR FOREIGN MINISTER FAVORS USSR MIDEAST ROLE

LD272322 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1945 GMT 27 Jan 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Foreign Affairs Minister of Qatar Shaykh al-Thani has stated that the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East requires the direct participation of the Soviet Union in the process. In present conditions, the minister said, it is impossible to ignore the role of the Soviet Union in the Middle East nor its ability to exert a decisive influence on a peaceful change in the situation.

SOMALI OFFER OF TALKS WITH ETHIOPIA DENOUNCED

EA290142 Moscow in Somali to East Africa 1600 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Unattributed commentary from the "Africa as We See It" program]

[Text] While closing a cooperative congress recently, the president of Somalia, Mohamed Siad Barre, said that he is prepared to meet the Ethiopian leader, Mengistu Haile Mariam, in order to discuss the situation in the Horn of Africa with him.

Trying very hard to deceive Somali and world opinion he works hard to demonstrate a nonexistent Somali peace policy, blaming Ethiopia for the current tension in the Horn of Africa.

Mohamed Siad Barre has on many occasions spelled out his good intention of promoting good-neighborliness with all countries in the region and working for the solution of all causes of conflict in the region. But can anyone trust such statements when everybody knows that Mogadishu continues to lay claim to territories belonging to foreign countries and unleashes aggression on Djibouti, Kenya and Ethiopia, while at the same time strengthening its armed forces with assistance from Washington, on which it relies.

It is also known that the Somali Administration has permitted America to build military bases on its territory for the Rapid Deployment Force. It is also important to remember that last October, Mohamed Siad Barre said he was prepared to meet Mengistu Haile Mariam. The purpose of the meeting, Mohamed Siad Barre said, was to hold talks on the tension in the Horn of Africa. Mohamed Siad Barre has tried in vain on many occasions to convince people in Somali and the world at large of Somalia's good intentions of promoting peace in the Horn of Africa and of Ethiopia's responsibility for the tension, friction and conflict in the region, accusing it of fanning the fire in the area.

At that time the Somali Armed Forces were preparing to participate in a military exercise with the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force. At that time, all the countries having common borders with Somalia vehemently denounced the Somali-U.S. military maneuvers. As ADDIS ZEMEN, an Ethiopian newspaper, said, the military exercise was a military maneuver provocative to all countries in the region. The military exercise was also aimed at frightening those countries in the Horn of Africa region which have refused to bow down to U.S. imperialist policies.

Mohammad Siad Barre's proposal for talks with Ethiopian leader Mengistu Haile Mariam last October was followed by many treacherous acts against Ethiopia by units of the so-called Western Somalia Liberation Front controlled by Xamar [Mogadishu]. At the same time, terrorist activities by units of bandits stationed in Somalia against Kenya's northern territories continues unabated. The terrorists continue to molest, kill and pillage Kenyan Government officials and the general public in the northern districts of Kenya.

The statement by the president of Somalia, Mohamed Siad Barre, also aims at blaming the Ethiopian leadership for refusing to hold talks with Somalia on how to solve the conflict in the Horn of Africa. As usual, blaming Ethiopia is easy because the proposed meeting has unacceptable preconditions linked to the recognition of Somalia's claims to parts of Ethiopia's territory.

Mohamed Siad Barre's latest statement was just the same. The outcome of the recent visit to Somalia by an Italian Socialist Party delegation and the joint Somali-Italian communique discreetly justified Somali claims to foreign territories. At the same time, Mohamed Siad Barre declared that he is prepared to hold talks with Mengistu Haile Mariam, the leader of Ethiopia, while saying that such talks can be held only if there is mutual trust.

Mohamed Siad Barre's argument is not a new proposal, a point emphasized by the ruler of Mogadishu who is known for his obdurate policies.

It is absolutely clear that such policies will be of no good to the peoples of the region.

ASPECTS OF U.S.-S. AFRICA RELATIONS EXAMINED

U.S.-Sponsored 'Nuclear Ambitions'

LD310943 Moscow TASS in English 0838 GMT 31 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS -- The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission has officially acknowledged that 88 South African scientists had been trained at American laboratories. Besides, the newspaper PRAVA writes today, Washington rendered Pretoria all-round aid in building a national atomic reserach centre in Pelindara. A Safari-1 nuclear reactor was purchased for the centre from the American firm Allis-Chambers in 1961, and later Safari-2. The United States and South Africa concluded an agreement on providing Pelendaba with enriched uranium up to the year 2007. Its overall amount, already shipped to the centre, exceeds 100 kilograms. This is sufficient to make 9-10 atomic bombs.

Pretoria is one of the largest uranium exporters in the capitalist world. But its enrichment is the most complicated, expensive and secret element in the nuclear technology.

It is indicative, the newspaper points out, that it is precisely in this direction that South African atomic physicists are now working. South Africa's Prime Minister Vorster told Parliament in the summer of 1970 that the country's scientists mastered the "unique" method of uranium enrichment. Five years later, a top secret uranium enrichment plant was put into operation in Valindaba, near Pelindaba.

On the issue of why Pretoria carries out nuclear research in secrecy and refuses to place it under control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the newspaper cites a report by the U.S. Defence Intelligence Agency which says that the Republic of South Africa has considerably expanded its nuclear capacities and acquired technical evidence in favor of this conclusion. An American spy satellite registered an unusually bright flash in the ocean off the South African shores in Autumn 1979. Experts came to the conclusion that the mysterious blast was most likely due to nuclear testing. A year later similar pictures were made from outer space. CIA researchers and experts prepared a report in this connection for the U.S. Government. But official Washington shelved it.

In carrying out aggressive actions against neighbouring African nations, PRAVDA writes in conclusion, the racists are stretching out their hands toward a nuclear push-button. The United States not only turns a blind eye to the apartheid regime's nuclear ambitions, but also cooperates with South Africa, providing it with raw materials, equipment and technology for the development of weapons of mass annihilation.

Similar to U.S.-Israeli Ties

LD281918 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Excerpts] Now a look at the situation in southern Africa from our observer Kim Gerasimov. This is what he writes:

Although southern Africa and the Middle East lie several thousand kilometers apart, the two regions are increasingly grouped together.

United Nations Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, speaking at a press conference a few days ago, warned that the situation shaping in the south of Africa might become as volatile as that in the Middle East. And indeed, like Israel, the racist white minority regime of South Africa is waging an undeclared war against neighbors who only recently rid themselves of colonial dependence.

Some of the atrocities the racists have committed can be linked to the Israeli-perpetrated massacres at the Palestinian refugee camps at Sabra and Shatila. The purpose is clear -- to intimidate the African peoples, to prevent the final liberation of the continent from colonialism and racism, and hopefully, to reverse the process and saddle the newly-liberated countries with pro-neocolonialist regimes. In a word, South Africa play the role of an imperialist policemen, just as Israel does in the Middle East. Both Tel Aviv and Pretoria are backed by the United States, which has huge financial interests in South Africa and Namibia. While condemning the racist Pretoria regime in words, Washington is actually giving it all-round political support, and this has been acknowledged even by the United States' press.

TIME magazine, for example, has remarked that it was the United States that began to insist on linking independence for Namibia with the issue of Cuban troops' withdrawal from Angola. Pretoria sees this linkage proposal as a pretext for constantly delaying free elections in Namibia, the magazine said. At this point may I remind you that Cuban troops are legally present in Angola. They were introduced there at the request of the Angolan Government to help repel aggression from South Africa. As far as the United States is concerned, it actively cooperates with the racists in the military sphere, often using Israel as a go-between.

Independent Africa has been deeply alarmed by the recent report that America and South Africa have concluded a secret agreement on deploying United States cruise missiles on South African territory. The situation in the south of the African Continent is indeed dangerous, and the responsibility for this lies as much with Pretoria as with Washington because of their policies of neocolonialism, oppression and exploitation of other nations.

TELEGRAMS EXCHANGED WITH UPPER VOLTA LEADER

PM281145 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jan 83 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent a telegram to Jean-Baptiste Oeudraogo, chairman of the Provisional Peoples Salvation Council and head of state of the Republic of Upper Volta, conveying congratulations and best wishes the friendly Upper Voltan people on the country's national holiday -- Republic Day.

In a reply telegram J.-B. Ouedraogo expressed on behalf of the Upper Voltan people, the Provisional Council for National Salvation and the country's government and on his own account profound gratitude for the congratulations and best wishes.

BRIEFS

SHAKIROV DEPARTS FOR MAURITIUS -- The Muslim board of Central Asia and the Kazakh SSR has informed the Tashkent radio correspondent that Yusupkhan Shakirov, deputy director of the board, has departed for Mauritius. He will be taking part in a religious meeting of clergymen from various countries to be held in Mauritius between 25 January and 3 February. [Excerpt] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 25 Jan 83 GF]

PENDING U.S.-HONDURAS MILITARY EXERCISES DISCUSSED

Rumored Policy Changes Belied

LD290529 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 2015 GMT 28 Jan 83

[From "The World Today" program, presented by political observer Igor Fesunenko]

[Excerpts] In America, in the United States, Washington has always been a generator of rumors and gossip for the entire country. Under the present administration, when the disorder and confusion in all spheres of state life have reached simply unprecedented dimensions, rumors and gossip also spread around with most remarkable rapidity. Recently, for instance, there has been much talk in Washington about important changes in Latin American policy allegedly being discussed in the higher echelons of the administration. These rumors, seething about in great numbers and described in much graphic detail and at great length, assert, for instance, that one of the chief inspirers of the forthcoming changes in that careful pragmatist George Shultz, the U.S. secretary of state, who, having taken up that post, aims allegedly to amend the evil caused to the pan-American system and inter-American relations by the overly zealous Alexander Haig, his predecessor in that post, who demonstrated too much soldierly reserve.

It is reported that Shultz has already conducted some sort of conference in the State Department, and at a very high level, to review Latin American policy; and that Jeane Kirkpatrick, U.S. permanent representative at the UN, who considers herself to be a major expert in this sphere, was extremely hurt and even astounded that she was not paid the honor of being invited to this conference. Political observers, however, consider the recent trip to Mexico and Caracas by the assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, to be the most obvious sign of the forthcoming turnabout in Washington's Latin American policy.

However, rumors are rumors, and there is so far no evidence that the present administration genuinely intends to resort to any sort of serious change in its Latin American course. On the contrary, the adherents of the hard-line in relation to Latin America are not yielding their positions; evidence of this is the U.S.-Honduras maneuvers planned for the beginning of February to the general indignation of the countries of the region. These maneuvers will be conducted in Honduras near the Nicaraguan border. This is a frank challenge and a brazen provocation, an attempt to throw new fuel upon the bonfire of hatred and enmity which has been laid through Washington's fault; it is a threat not only to Nicaragua but also to the peace and security of all the peoples of this region. That is what these maneuvers are.

'New Undisguised Provocation'

LD281214 Moscow TASS in English 1045 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] Managua January 28 TASS -- TASS correspondent S. Gorbunov reports: Mammoth C-130 U.S. Air Force transport planes roar over and land one after another at Honduran Air Force bases bringing in weapons and combat equipment to that Central American country. U.S. ships are under way to the Port of Lempira carrying aboard several thousand officers and men of the U.S. and Honduran Armed Forces.

All this comes within the framework of preparations for a new undisguised provocation against revolutionary Nicaragua -- a move to which U.S. military planners refer as Big Pine military exercises. During the first week of February, the United States and Honduras are to deploy its combat units not far from the Nicaraguan border precisely in those areas where thousands of U.S.-trained Somoza cut-throats are currently based.

According to the news agency NUEVA NICARAGUA, air force planes and naval ships are to take part in the exercises alongside land forces.

A large-scale provocation planned by the U.S. Administration in Central America constitutes a component part of its dangerous policy of kindling a military conflict in the region. It is indicative that one week before the exercises were scheduled to begin the Honduran regime alerted its Armed Forces under the pretext of a possible increase in Guerrilla operations.

It should also be noted that several days ago a delegation of the U.S. Department of State arrived in Tegucigalpa to hold talks with the local authorities on ensuring the safety of U.S. capital investments in that country in case of war.

POLITBURO MEETING ON GROMYKO TRIP, AGRICULTURE

LD281625 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Politburo heard a report by Comrade Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, on the results of his visits to the FRG and the GDR.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo approved the meetings and conversations held by Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko with Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and other GDR leaders. The exchange of views held confirmed the full identity of opinions between the CPSU and the SED on all questions discussed.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo approved the results of Comrade Gromyko's visit to the FRG and noted the importance of the fact that during the discussions with the FRG leaders both sides expressed the conviction that good prospects exist for the further development of relations between the USSR and the FRG on the basis of the Moscow Treaty and other agreements.

The Soviet Union's proposals toward reducing nuclear armaments in Europe have evoked increasingly broad response in the European countries, including the FRG. These proposals have been justifiably described as providing a real opportunity for reaching a mutually acceptable accord which would prevent another round of the arms race and lessen the danger of war. During the discussion of this question it was pointed out at the meeting that the state leadership of the FRG can make a contribution of its own to preventing the West European NATO countries from being turned into a zone of a further, massive accumulation of American nuclear weapons.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo heard information about some questions related to the setting up of agroindustrial amalgamations and discussed other issues.

The appropriate organs are entrusted with the task of precisely organizing and coordinating the working of the new system of managing agriculture and other branches of the agroindustrial complex.

In mastering the new style of management special emphasis must be laid on enhancing the responsibility of kolkhozes and sovkhozes for fulfilling state plans for the procurement of agricultural produce. Great importance in this must be attached to efficient use of the production potential of each agricultural link, to observing a regime of economy and thrift, to consolidating financial autonomy, and to introducing progressive forms of organization and payment for work.

In the discussion attention was drawn to the impermissibility of bureaucratic administration, of imposing on kolkhozes and sovkhozes various sorts of recommendations and instructions on questions falling within the competence of those in charge and specialists from the farms. The attention of party and administrative organs was drawn to the matter of cadres of specialists being released from their duties in connection with the reorganization of agricultural management organs, who whould be retained in the branches of the agroindustrial complex, and used at work directly on kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The session heard the question of the measures taken to implement the CPSU Central Committee Politburo's decision on preparations for spring sowing. It was noted that the rate of preparation for spring sowing increased in January.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo also stressed the need for intensified control by the appropriate ministries, departments and enterprises of the agroindustrial complex, in order to ensure prompt and high-quality implementation by every rayon, every kolkhoz and sovkhoz, of all organizational and economic measures to prepare for spring fieldwork. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo approved the USSR Council of Minister's proposal on measures to increase productivity of natural hay-mowings and pastures.

Arising from the volume of stockbreeding production outlines in the Food Program, provision is made for an increase in procurements of coarse and succulent pastureland, and a strengthening of the material-technical base of meadow and pasture farming. It is planned to implement a number of other measures aimed at implementing the tasks set.

PONOMAREV ADDRESSES SEMINAR FOR PROPAGANDISTS

LD291527 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 29 Jan 83

[From the Vremya Newscast]

[Text] A seminar has been held in the CPSU Central Committee for workers in the press, news agencies, the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio, and the central ideological organizations. There was a discussion on further perfecting propaganda work in the light of the decisions of the 26th party congress, the resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee, and the provisions and conclusions proposed in speeches by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov at the CPSU Central Committee November plenum and the solemn meeting dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR. Reports were given by Comrade Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrades Zimyanin and Rusakov, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; and other comrades.

Those taking part in the conference included CPSU Central Committee department heads Zamyatin, Stuklain, Chervenenko and Shauro; and first deputy heads of CPSU Central Committee departments Rakhmanin and Smirnov. There was an exchange of experience in news and propaganda work at the seminar conference.

ALIYEV, OTHERS ADDRESS TRANSPORTATION QUESTIONS

LD282003 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Jan 83

[From Vremya newscast]

[Text] An extended session was held today of the Collegium of the Ministry of Transport Construction, together with the presidia of the Central Committees of the Railway Transport Workers Union and of the Motor Transport and Highway Workers Union. A report was delivered by Comrade Sosnov, minister of transport construction. Those taking part in the session analyzed the state of the industry which is responsible for construction of projects of railway, sea, air, river and motor vehicle transport. Special attention was paid to the need for further raising the level of leadership and management in the areas of economizing, reducing the losses in working time, strengthening planning and production discipline, with the aim of unconditional fulfillment of state assignments in commission production facilities, housing, and social and consumer projects in order to increase traffic capacity and improve the working and living conditions of the working people.

Comrade Aliyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers spoke at the session. Taking part in the work of the collegium were Comrade Simonov, head of a department of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Guzhenko and Konarev, ministers of the USSR; and other comrades.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 27-29 JANUARY

LD300849 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 27-29 January. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

27 January

In North Osetia all plows and cultivators are ready for spring fieldwork; other equipment overhaul is ahead of schedule. (0500 GMT)

In Kirghizia 150,000 Hecares -- over half the winter crop area -- has been top-dressed. (0500 GMT)

28 January

For most farms of the Omsk Irtysh area, wintering is not easy now. The main farming areas in autumn did not get enough fodder, and suffered from drought. Naturally, the animals' rations are now not as generous as last year: More straw is being used instead of hay, and the use of silage has been reduced. The oblast committee of the CPSU and the Executive Committee of the oblast Soviet of People's deputies appealed to all animal farmers of the oblast to fight the difficulties with initiative, accurate, thrifty counting, efficiency and discipline. This appeal found wide support among all workers of agriculture. (1200 GMT)

29 January

IZVESTIYA publishes on page one a report on agriculture in Kazakhstan. The winter there has been unusual with little snowfall either in the south or in northern virgin lands areas. Naturally this has slowed the rate of snow retention; it has been carried out on 13 million hectares, just 1/2 the normal area. Spring sowing equipment overhaul is proceeding rapidly, but almost one-third of the large number of Kirovets and other tractors are still laid up due to a shortage of spare parts. (0200 GMT)

In Kirov Oblast, of the 2.3 million hectares of sowing area, personal plots and orchards account for 43,000 hectares. That is not very much -- less than 2 percent; but according to statistical data these 2 percent provide the oblast with almost 1/2 the gross potato harvest, and 60 percent of the vegetable harvest; personal orchards grow much more fruit and berries than farms of the Plodoovoshchprom. The personal holdings of animals also look impressive: They provide over 1/4 of total animal husbandry production, This is the subject of an article in TRUD, which notes that output could be even higher with horses and minitractors on the plots. (0200 GMT)

NEW RSFSR MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE APPOINTED

LD281718 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 28 Jan 83

[Text] The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has released Comrade Leonid Yakovlevich Florentyev from his post of RSFSR Minister of Agriculture in connection with his retirement on pension. The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Comrade Viktor Petrovich Nikonov as RSFSR Minister of Agriculture.

RSFSR LAND RECLAMATION PROBLEMS, TASKS DISCUSSED

LD271539 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 12 Jan 83

[Text] An extended meeting of the Collegium of the RSFSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources is taking place to discuss results of the work done and the tasks for 1983 in the light of the CPSU Central Committee November plenum and the provisions and conclusions presented in the report by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. The Collegium paid attention mainly to improving the use of reclaimed land on kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

Comrade Kalashnikov, the minister, pointed out in his report that vast sums are being appropriated for the development of land reclamation work. Last year 130,000 hectares of irrigated and drained land was put into service and work was carried out to qualitatively improve existing irrigation systems. Many main pipelines were constructed. The best results were achieved by workers of the Donvodstroy and Altayvodstroy associations, the Tambovvodstroy and Kurskmeleovodstroy trusts, and other enterprises.

At the same time the minister and other speakers pointed out that the crop yield of improved lands is rising very slowly and in many areas has dropped. Even in Kuban Kray last year less grain was obtained from irrigated lands than on an average during the preceding 5-year period. Examples were cited when irrigated land is no different from nonirrigated areas as far as yields are concerned. Last year reclaimed land in the central and Northwestern Regions were not used to full capacity -- most of the fields were not watered -- and for the RSFSR as a whole last year no water was supplied to an area exceeding 400,000 hectares.

The Collegium demanded that leaders of land reclamation organizations change their attitude to the land on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and influence more actively an improvement in the crop yield.

The work of land reclamation will now be assessed according to its final result, that is, according to the yield obtained from the fields.

The Collegium also analyzed the state of affairs on projects nearing completion. In Bashkir ASSR, Krasnoyarsk Kray and Novosibirsk, Irkutsk and some other oblasts plans for the construction of land reclamation systems are systematically remaining unfulfilled; frequently the quality of the work does not accord with present-day demands. There is a great number of incomplete construction projects. The Collegium outlined specific measures to eliminate shortcomings with the expectation that as much agricultural produce as possible is to be obtained from irrigated and drained lands.